

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University Long Beach

Professional Services Division

May 2, 2007

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at California State University Long Beach. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for California State University, Long Beach and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Adapted Physical Education Specialist Credential

Administrative Services Credential

Preliminary

Preliminary Internship

Professional

Clinical Rehabilitative Services

Language, Speech and Hearing

Audiology

Education Specialist Credentials

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship

Professional Level II

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Library Media Credential

Multiple Subject Credential

Multiple Subject

Multiple Subject Internship

BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Spanish and Vietnamese)

Pupil Personnel Services Credential

School Counseling

School Counseling Internship

Pupil Personnel Services Credential

School Psychology

School Psychology Internship

Pupil Personnel Services Credential

School Social Work

Pupil Personnel Services Credential

Child Welfare and Attendance

Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Reading Certificate

Reading and Language Arts Specialist

School Nurse Credential

Single Subject Credential

Single Subject Credential

Single Subject Internship

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University Long Beach be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University Long Beach be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2013-2014 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of

accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Background Information

The Institution

California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) is a public, urban, comprehensive university with an enrollment of approximately 34,000 students. The university began in 1949 as Los Angeles-Orange County State College. It was renamed Long Beach State College when it was moved to its present site. It became Long Beach State University in 1972, and California State University at Long Beach in 1982. It is one of 23 campuses in the public California State University (CSU) system and one of 22 offering education programs.

CSULB is located in the city of Long Beach, just south of the city of Los Angeles. The 322 acre campus's primary service area is the greater Los Angeles Basin, a population base of more than 5 million. The city of Long Beach is an urban municipality of about one-half million people that was identified by USA Today as the most diverse city in the United States based on 2000 census data. Long Beach is one of the world's largest shipping ports, and major industries include aerospace, medicine and tourism

The campus offers a broad range of baccalaureate and graduate degrees spanning the liberal arts and sciences and many applied and professional fields: 81 baccalaureate degree programs, 67 master's degree programs, 16 education related credential programs, two joint doctoral degrees and, beginning fall 2007, one free-standing doctoral degree in Educational Leadership.

The Unit

The unit comprises baccalaureate, certificate, credential, and master's degree programs housed in three departments in the College of Education (CED) and five affiliated programs located in the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS). No programs are offered off-campus completely although some programs have off-campus cohorts, and some programs have individual courses that meet off campus. No programs are delivered entirely on line. The Unit Programs Table lists the programs offered. Programs housed in the College of Health and Human Services are:

- Clinical Rehabilitative Services (authorization in speech and hearing)
- Designated Subjects Credential for Vocational and Adult Education
- Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work Credential
- School Nursing Credential
- Adapted Physical Education

The Designated Subjects Credential and the School Social Work and School Nursing Credentials are not reviewed by NCATE

Unit Programs Table						
Program	Award	Program Level	# of Candidates Admitted 2005-06	Agency Review	Most Recent CCTC Approval	National Recognition Status
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs						
Multiple Subject Credential Program	Credential	Initial	557	CCTC NCATE	1/03	N/A
Single Subject Credential Program	Credential	Initial	497	CCTC NCATE	5/04	N/A
Education Specialist Credential Program, Level I	Level I Credential	Initial	65	CCTC NCATE	4/01	N/A
Advanced (Continuing) Teacher Preparation Programs						
MS Degree in Special Education, including Education Specialist Level II Credential Program	Level II Credential MA	Advanced	18 (credential) 43 (MA)	CCTC NCATE	4/01	N/A
Adapted Physical Education Credential (included in Single Subject Physical Education Credential Program, or available as an additional authorization)	Credential	Advanced	15	CCTC NCATE	4/01	N/A
MA Degree in Education, Option in Elementary Education, Dual Language Development Specialization	MA	Advanced	N/A	NCATE	N/A	N/A
MA Degree in Education, Option in Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education Specialization	MA	Advanced	41	NCATE	N/A	
MA Degree in Education, Option in Elementary Education, Curriculum & Instruction Specialization	MA	Advanced	75	NCATE	N/A	N/A
MA Degree in Education, Option in Secondary Education, Curriculum & Instruction, Specialization	MA	Advanced	16	NCATE	N/A	
Programs for Other School Personnel						
MA Degree in Education, Option in Elementary or Secondary Education, Reading & Language Arts Specialization (includes Reading and Language Arts Specialist Professional Clear Credential)	Credential MA	Advanced	35	CCTC NCATE	4/01	N/A
MA Degree in Education, Option in Educational Administration (includes Administrative Services Tier I Credential)	Credential MA	Advanced	30	CCTC NCATE	4/01	N/A
Administrative Services Tier II Credential	Credential	Advanced	16	CCTC NCATE	4/01	N/A
MA Degree in Education, Option in Educational Technology	MA	Advanced	16	NCATE	N/A	N/A
MA Degree in Education, Option in School Librarianship (including Library Media Teacher Services Professional Clear Credential)	Credential MA	Advanced	29	CCTC NCATE	4/01	N/A
MA Degree in Education, Option in Educational Psychology	MA	Advanced	9	NCATE	N/A	N/A
School Psychology Pupil Personnel Services Professional Clear Credential (Note: School Psychology received NASP accreditation in 2005)	Credential	Advanced	22	CCTC NCATE	8/03	NASP
MS Degree in Counseling, Option in School Counseling (including School Counseling Pupil Personnel Services Professional Clear Credential)	Credential MA	Advanced	29	CCTC NCATE	1/04	N/A

Unit Programs Table						
Program	Award	Program Level	# of Candidates Admitted 2005-06	Agency Review	Most Recent CCTC Approval	National Recognition Status
Clinical Rehabilitative Services Pupil Personnel Services Professional Clear Credential (authorization in speech and hearing and audiology)	Credential	Advanced	22	CCTC NCATE	4/01	ASHA
Designated Subjects Credential	Credential	Advanced	354	CCTC NCATE	4/01	N/A
School Social Work	Credential	Advanced	22	CCTC	1/05	N/A
School Nursing	Credential	Advanced	4	CCYC	4/01	N/A

Source: Credential Center, Institutional Research

In 2005-2006 enrollment in unit programs was 2124 FTES. In 2005-06, there were 81 full time and 143 part time faculty members. There were 98 part time clinical supervisors and 10 full time clinical supervisors. The one graduate assistant did not teach education courses. (Data for the faculty is from Table 5.03 in the IR Tables and Figures document. Data for clinical supervisors and graduate assistants is from Table A.06, IR Tables and Figures document.)

California law requires that candidates in a multiple subject (elementary) or single subject (secondary) program be able to complete the program in one calendar year. Upon successful completion of all requirements, candidates are recommended for a preliminary credential. They subsequently complete a two-year induction program provided by the district in which they are employed in order to receive a professional clear credential. For Special Education program candidates, these two levels are referred to as Level I and Level II. The university, rather than the employing school district, provides the Level II program.

The Preliminary Multiple Subject Credential listed in the Unit Programs Table authorizes holders to teach in self-contained classrooms, primarily found in elementary classrooms. Candidates may complete the elementary program in conjunction with a bachelor's degree in liberal studies, Integrated Program, or as a post-baccalaureate student. Post-baccalaureate students in the Multiple Subject Credential may also choose to complete the requirements for a Bilingual Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) certificate, which authorizes them to provide academic instruction to English learner students in their primary language. In addition, candidates may complete their program as part of an Internship Program. The Internship Program accepts qualified candidates who have completed required prerequisite courses and have been hired by a participating school district. Candidates complete their credential coursework over the course of one year while working for a slightly reduced salary.

The Preliminary Single Subject Credential, listed in the Unit Programs Table authorizes holders to teach in the subject area specified on the credential in departmentalized classrooms, primarily found in secondary schools. The Education Specialist Credential authorizes holders to teach in Special Education settings.

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This was a continuing accreditation visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The visit merged the accreditation processes of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) according to the approved protocol. The Accreditation Team, which included membership from the COA and NCATE, received a single Institutional Self-Study Report, worked from a common interview schedule, and collaborated on all decisions related to accreditation standards.

The merged visit was based upon the partnership agreement reached between the COA and NCATE. The first partnership agreement was developed and signed in 1989. The Partnership was revised and renewed in 1996 and subsequently revised and renewed in 2001. The Partnership Agreement requires that all California universities who are NCATE accredited participate in reviews that are merged with the State's accreditation process. The agreement allows the university the option to respond to the NCATE 2000 Standards, provided that the Commission's Common Standards are addressed in the context of that response. It also allows the subsequent accreditation team report to be written based upon those standards.

California State University Long Beach exercised that option. In addition, the institution must respond to all appropriate Program Standards. The agreement also states that the teams will be merged, will share common information and interview schedules, and will collect data and reach conclusions about the quality of the programs in a collaborative manner. However, the accreditation team will take the common data collected by the team and adapt it according to the needs of the respective accrediting bodies.

This is because the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board requires a report that uses the familiar language and format of the NCATE standards rather than the language that is needed for the COA (i.e., information about Common Standards and Program Standards.) Under the provisions of the partnership agreement, California universities are not required to submit Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations for review. The state review stands in place of that requirement.

Since the last BOE visit to CSULB in 2001, there have been three program discontinuances in the unit, and one program has been added. The Early Childhood Education credential and the Middle School option of the Multiple Subject Program were discontinued in 2005; the Middle School Specialization of the Master of Arts Option was discontinued in fall 2006. The Dual Language Development Specialization of the Masters of Arts in Education was approved in 2006. Planning and initial development for a new education doctoral program in educational leadership began in 2006. The first cohort will enter in fall 2007. The program has been approved by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and the CSU system.

California uses the joint visit protocol. For this visit, the NCATE team consisted of five BOE members and two state members and the state team was made up of 16 members. One state representative was assigned as co-chair to the NCATE team and chaired the State team. Two consultants from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) worked with both

teams. Each team prepares a report, with the NCATE findings and recommendations integrated into the state report. State standards are directly aligned and cross-referenced with the NCATE standards. The state team and national BOE members conferred regularly on program items during the visit. State consultants were available to the team to provide expert guidance in credentialing requirements and program expectations.

State protocol specifies state program reviews in place of Specialty Professional Associations reviews. The unit submitted responses to State program standards (or approved alternatives) for all program areas. California Program Standards (or one of the approved Program Standards options described in Section 3 of the Accreditation Framework) were utilized for each credential program area. The Communicative Disorders programs received recognition by American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.

The joint team attended a reception that showcased program activities and student work, followed by interviews with field supervisors and alumni. Additionally, NCATE team members visited two off-campus field experience sites and interviewed student teachers and cooperating teachers. The state team visited 15 schools- including elementary schools, middle schools, high schools,

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant, Teri Clark, was assigned to the institution in Fall 2005, and met with institutional leadership in Spring 2006. The meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Randall Lindsey, was selected in Fall 2006. The Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Lelia Vickers, was assigned in Fall 2006. On February 2, 2007, the NCATE co-chair and the staff consultant met with the representatives of California State University Long Beach to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the NCATE unit standards and appropriate references to the California Common Standards. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using Option One, California Program Standards for all programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the School of Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of twenty-three consisting of the NCATE Co-chair, the California Co-chair, a Common Standards Cluster that would include four NCATE members and two COA members; a Basic Credential Cluster of nine members; and a Services Credential Cluster of seven members. The Dean and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework* and experience in merged accreditation visits.

The COA Team Leader and the Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners served as Co-Chairs of the visit. Each member of the COA/NCATE Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the University's responses to the NCATE Standards/Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the Basic and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered unit issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Saturday, April 28. On Saturday mid-day, the Team Leader and the COA members of the Common Standards Cluster and CTC staff began their deliberations with the NCATE team members. It included orientation to the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for both the COA and NCATE team members. The Common Standards Cluster began its examination of documents on the campus the rest of Saturday and on Sunday morning. The remainder of the team arrived on Sunday mid-day, April 29, with a meeting of the team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a poster session and reception on Sunday afternoon to provide an orientation to the institution. This was followed by further meetings of the clusters to prepare for the activities of the next day.

On Monday and Tuesday, April 30 and May 1, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The institution arranged to transport members of the team to various local school sites used for collaborative activities. There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday morning, the team Co-chairs met with institutional leadership for a mid-visit status report. This provided an opportunity to identify areas in which the team had concerns and for which additional information was being sought. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work

sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the NCATE/Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the NCATE/Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the standards were "Met with Concerns". The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and Concerns beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standard.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards pointing out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and Concerns not rising to the level of finding a standard less than fully met.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

The entire team met on Tuesday evening to review the findings and make decisions about the results of the visit. The team discussed each NCATE/Common Standard and decided that the all six of the NCATE standards were met at the initial level and four of the standards are met at the advanced level. For purposes of the COA report, all Common Standards are met, all elements of the CTC Common Standards were addressed, and all program standards are met.

The team then made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," "Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations," or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of "**Accreditation.**" The recommendation for "Accreditation" was based on the unanimous agreement of the team and that the overall evidence clearly supported the recommendation. Following the decision, the team went on to complete the written accreditation report, which was reviewed by the team on Wednesday morning. A draft of the report was presented to the faculty late Wednesday morning.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

INSTITUTION: California State University Long Beach

DATES OF VISIT: April 28-May 2, 2007

**ACCREDITATION TEAM
RECOMMENDATION:** Accreditation

RATIONALE:

The accreditation team conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report, the program documents for each approved credential program, and the supporting evidence. In addition, interviews were conducted with candidates in various stages of the programs, program completers who have been in the field for at least one year, faculty, staff and administration of the university, employers of graduates, field supervisors and advisory committee members. Team members obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making judgements about the educator preparation programs offered by the institution.

The recommendations pertaining to the accreditation status of California State University Long Beach and all of its credential programs was determined based on the following:

NCATE's SIX STANDARDS AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: The university elected to use the NCATE format and to write to NCATE's unit standards to meet the COA Common Standards requirement. There was extensive cross-referencing to the COA Common Standards. Also, the corresponding part of this team report utilizes the NCATE standards and format. The total team (NCATE and COA members) reviewed each element of the six NCATE Standards, added appropriate areas of the Common Standards, and voted as to whether the standard was met, not met, or met with areas of improvement or concern.

PROGRAM STANDARDS: Team clusters for (1) Basic credential programs (Multiple and Single Subject—including internship, Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis, Adapted Physical Education Specialist, Reading Certificate and Reading/Language Arts Specialist, Designated Subjects: Vocational Education and Adult Education, and Education Specialist in Special Education – Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe—including internship); (2) Services credential programs (Administrative Services including Preliminary, Preliminary Internship, Professional, Clinical and Rehabilitative Services, Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, School Social Work, School Counseling including Internship) reviewed all program areas. Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total merged team membership was provided to each of the clusters. Following these discussions of each program reviewed by the total team, NCATE and COA considered whether the program standards were either met, met with concerns, or not met.

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend **Accreditation** was based on team consensus that the all six of NCATE Standards are met at the initial level and four of the six standards are met at the advanced level. All six of the standards are met for purposes of the COA report, all elements of the CCTC Common Standards were addressed and met within the context of the NCATE report, and that all Program Standards are met for the unit's programs. One of the programs has a Program Standard met with a concern.

ACCREDITATION TEAM

State Team Leader: **Randall Lindsey** (Team Co-Chair)
California Lutheran University

NCATE Team Leader **Lelia Vickers** (Team Co-Chair and
Common Standards Cluster Leader)
North Carolina A & T State University

NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:

Dennis E. Potthoff (NCATE Member)
University of Nebraska at Kearney

Laverne A. Moore (NCATE Member)
McKinley High School, Hawaii

Jack Rhoton (NCATE Member)
East Tennessee State University

Yvonne Lux (CCTC/COA Member)
California Lutheran University

John Nagle (CCTC/COA Member)
University of the Pacific

Basic Credential Cluster:

Juan Flores, (Cluster Leader)
California State University, Stanislaus

Sally J. Botzler
Humboldt State University

Dan Elliott
Azusa Pacific University

Charles “Buck” Weber
Ivy Academia Charter Academy

Brenda Steppes
Los Angeles Unified School District

Peter Kopriva
Fresno Pacific University

Jane Duckett
National University

Walt Trojanowski
Azusa Unified School District

Barbara Price
Coast Community College

Services Credential Cluster:

Gary Hoban, (Cluster Leader)
National University

Marcel Soriano
California State University, Los Angeles

Louis H. Shaup
Rialto Unified School District

Laverne Aguirre-Parmley
Alum Rock Elementary School District

Caron Mellblom
CSU, Dominguez Hills

Mary Purucker
Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District

Janet Chang
San Jose City College

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
 Institutional Self Study
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Course Materials
 Information Booklets
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae

Portfolios
 Candidate Work Samples
 Exit Surveys
 Assessment Data
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Reports
 Electronic exhibits

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stand. Cluster	Basic Credentia 1 Cluster	Services Credentia 1 Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	12	40	123	38	213
Institutional Administration	5	7	5	11	28
Candidates	11	41	313	157	522
Graduates	5	1	59	44	109
Employers of Graduates	4	2	30	31	67
Supervising Practitioners	0	0	51	40	91
Advisors	0	0	21	27	48
School Administrators	4	4	21	17	46
Credential Analyst	0	1	11	10	22
Tech Support	0	0	42	0	42
Advisory Committee	0	0	42	23	65
Staff	0	1	2	5	8
Total					1261

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Levels: Initial and Advanced

A. Content knowledge for teacher candidates

Data on student performance was not found aggregated across all programs at the initial and advanced levels. The unit provided annual assessments on its Program Assessment and Evaluation System (PAES) for initial and advanced programs, which outlines expected learning outcomes for the degree programs. The document required faculty to list all student outcomes; identify where students would encounter opportunities to gain the knowledge; describe how student learning would be assessed, and indicate how results would be used. This plan had not been implemented, hence data was not summarized for all programs. The institutional report summarized data for most of the initial programs, but the majority of the advanced and school personnel programs did not have summarized data that assessed the candidates' learning outcomes. In other words, two semesters of data was not available for each program at the advanced level. The Task Stream technology was used to aggregate data for multiple subjects at the initial level and early childhood at the advanced level.

No agreement was made regarding which technology would support all programs to review and validate data in one program. Data for other initial programs were found in various documents such as program evaluations and reports. Data was not consistently collected, analyzed or used for program evaluation.

The California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) is used for content knowledge and is required for licensure at the initial level. All programs have a 100 percent pass rate because the test is required prior to admission to student teaching.

The other key means of assessing content knowledge is by review of a transcript compared to a state-approved subject matter program. However, the review of the transcript provides no performance data on candidates. In addition, demonstration of competence in reading is assessed on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). This test is used for the Multiple Subject and Educational Specialist programs. For the Single Subject Program (secondary), candidates demonstrate their knowledge through the completion of a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing-approved program of study in the subject of teaching authorization or its equivalent, or by passing a CCTC-approved examination (i.e., CSET in the content area).

The CSET content area exam pass rate for the past two semesters is 100 percent, which suggests that candidates are well-prepared in their knowledge of content. For candidates electing to use the approved program path, all had completed the program with at least a 2.67 GPA.

All of the unit programs are approved by the State of California and the state standards are aligned with the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Principles, and Specialized Program Association (SPA). The State conducts its own program review and the SPA approval is not sought by the institution.

Initial

At the initial level, there are three programs: Single Subject (secondary), Multiple Subject (elementary) and Education Specialist (special education). The CSET is used to assess content knowledge for Multiple Subject (elementary) and Education Specialist (special education) candidates. For the Single Subject (secondary) initial programs, candidates may take the CSET or complete an approved California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) program and a transcript review. Two additional assessments are required for the Education Specialist and Multiple Subject programs. One is the reading examination and the other is the California Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA), which was developed by Educational Testing Service. Candidates are evaluated on the TPA. The rubric has been validated by the Educational Testing Service.

Data show that candidates in the Multiple Subject and the Education Specialist programs passed the CSET 1 at 100 percent and CSET 2 at 99 percent for 2004-2005. The total data showed that of 648 students taking the tests, 645 passed. Additional data showed that of 1,158 initial candidates applying for admission in 2003-2004, 100 percent advanced. Data show further that 57 percent of program graduates demonstrated subject matter competence through completion of the CCTC approved subject matter program. Of that number, 77 percent completed course work at California State University at Long Beach. Each of the following key assessments provided performance data on candidates regarding content knowledge:

- Interviews from employers, candidates, field supervisors and faculty indicated that candidates developed the content required for entrance into the profession.
- Surveys sent to candidates and employers to collect data on candidates' performance were summarized. Candidates' perceptions of their preparedness as new teachers at the initial level showed that in 2004, 93 percent indicated they were well-prepared. In 2005-2006, data show that 95 percent of candidates felt they were well or adequately prepared.

In surveys of employment supervisors, more than 80 percent reported that candidates are well or adequately prepared.

As evidenced by assessment data, program evaluations, interviews and surveys, there is a concerted effort to ensure that candidates at the initial level are prepared to be effective practitioners who have knowledge in the subject matter and are committed to the conceptual framework.

Advanced

At the advanced level, candidates are required to have an initial license as one indication of content knowledge. According to the Institutional Report, advanced candidates will be assessed using the campus-wide regional accreditation guidelines based on student learning outlines. The initial assessment will be reported June 1, 2007; therefore, this performance data was not available. Further investigation in the PAES binder showed that the Early Childhood program had collected one semester of data.

Exit surveys are used to provide candidates' perception of their content knowledge, and data was available from the 2006 California State University survey. Candidates' perceptions at the initial level were that the program prepared them well in early childhood, curriculum and instruction, and in curriculum and instruction in Elementary and Secondary for spring 2005-06. For example, of 57 surveyed upon exiting the program (curriculum and instruction elementary and secondary), 87-100 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they were well prepared to conduct research and instructional design, use skill and knowledge for change, understand a variety of assessments and designs, and develop informed positions related to education. Over 90 percent of candidates strongly agreed or agreed that the program prepared them to understand research related to the field, write literature reviews and conduct inquiry and action research.

Supervisors also believe candidates possess content knowledge. On one survey measuring whether candidates had strengthened understanding, supervisors returned a rating of 3.58 on a 4-point scale (n 33), indicating that they strongly agreed with the item and the item on research-related development and learning for candidates, which was rated at 3.66.

An examination of Program Assessment and Evaluation yielded very little aggregate data related to student learning outcomes. While perceptions by candidates provide information, there is little performance data to determine the extent to which advanced candidates have content knowledge.

B. Content knowledge for other school personnel

It was not possible to adequately assess the content knowledge of other school personnel because no summarized analysis of data on other school personnel was presented on content knowledge. Program content by courses was listed; however, performance data based on student learning outcomes was not presented in summary or aggregated form. For example, the student learning outcomes that reflect the key knowledge, skills, and dispositions that candidates are expected to acquire were listed program by program in the Program Assessment and Evaluation System (PAES); however, the analysis of data was not available. Maintenance of a specific GPA is required; however no analysis of the GPA performance was provided. Candidate perception by candidates in the school psychology program show that upon exiting the program 88 percent of the candidates felt the program developed adequate content. No data was summarized from key assessments such as comprehensive examinations/theses, field experiences/practicum supervisor reports, and course GPAs, to show that candidates' had acquired content knowledge.

Survey data of candidate's perceptions were presented from reading and language arts and school psychology. The perceptions indicate that candidates perceive their content knowledge was adequate for entry into the profession at the advanced level. Survey data was not cited for other programs.

With such limited data, it was not possible to determine the extent to which candidates in other school personnel programs were prepared in content knowledge.

C. Pedagogical content knowledge for teachers

Initial

For the multiple subject programs, performance data related to pedagogical content knowledge indicated that of nine (9) key components of pedagogical content, candidates' ratings ranged from 3.51-3.90 for fall 2005 and 3.51-3.93 for spring 2006, with a mean score of 3.5 on a scale of 4. The educational specialist rating for student teaching on 12 pedagogical content items ranged from 3.25-3.53 on scale of 4. This data show that in the Multiple Subject and Educational Specialist programs, candidates have acquired pedagogical content.

Candidates in initial programs are also required to demonstrate their knowledge of principles of developmentally appropriate pedagogy and of specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instruction, as well as interpretation and use of assessment, and of adaptation of content for English learners. Overall data suggests those candidates perform well on the classroom assessments. The second project involves building a data set for the Teaching Performance Assessment. In pedagogical content knowledge, the educational specialist candidates were assessed on ability to demonstrate alignment to student need and competencies. The candidates were rated 87 percent competent with a score of 55 out of 60.

It seems that employers rate graduates higher than they rate themselves in the initial credential program on the ability to use computers for instructing and record-keeping. Interviews suggest that at the initial level, candidates have adequate pedagogical content for success upon initial induction into the profession.

The survey of perceptions shows that initial candidates' perception of their preparation for using technology at exit was 81 percent on use of computers and technology to help students learn, and 81 percent for use of computers for instruction and research in 2004-2005. Data suggest that candidates have knowledge and skill in using computers for instruction.

From data in pilot study of employers' surveys of perceptions, respondents perceive that candidates exit the program with strong pedagogical content. Educational specialist candidates are perceived to be strong in teaching of reading, language arts and mathematics. They were rated at 90 percent adequate.

D. Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers

Initial

Candidates in initial and advanced programs learn about professional organizations and apply state, national and institutional standards in assessment strategies, according to the course syllabi. There was no summarized performance data.

Course syllabi document that pedagogical and professional information included the following topics; however, no performance data was summarized to illustrate how candidates met the following learning outcomes:

- foundations of education
- the ways children and adolescents develop and the relationship to learning
- professional ethics, laws, and policies
- the use of research in teaching
- the roles and responsibilities of the professional communities
- diversity of student populations, families and communities
- the consideration of school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students.

In the area of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, candidates were assessed on the following item: effectively collaborates with families and other professional candidates. The candidates were rated at 98 percent, with 37 of 40 candidates responding. Professional competence for educational specialist candidates was rated though the following items: professional community responsibility at 4.30 of 5; intra-interpersonal skills, 4.27; attitude toward learners, 4.21. There was only one semester of this data.

Advanced

Survey data show that candidates' perception at exit of professional and pedagogical skills suggests that graduates perceived professional and pedagogical knowledge as a strength in preparation to work with students from diverse cultural backgrounds, and preparation to understand the connections among personal, family and community issues that interface with learning. In one survey, Early Childhood candidates' perceptions of their preparation range from 3.49-3.67 on a 4 point scale. Candidates perceive themselves to be well prepared in professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

The Early Childhood program had aggregated data for one semester. The data was in the Task Stream technology. Advanced candidates learn about institutional and state standards through their course work. Course syllabi document professional knowledge and skills; however, no data was summarized based on student learning outcomes.

E. Professional knowledge and skills for other school personnel

The following key assessments were identified for other school personnel: comprehensive examination/thesis, action research, research projects, practicum and intern supervisor evaluation and surveys of adult teaching methods. Of the 14 programs listed, nine (9) used comprehensive examination/thesis, and the remainder used practice intern/supervisor evaluation. Data was not summarized for candidates' performance or student learning outcomes. The number of candidates attempting and passing was provided. For fall 2005, 29 attempted the courses and 29 passed. In spring 2006, 256 attempted the comprehensive examination and seven (7) of the 256 failed. The test results suggest that candidates have knowledge based on the examination. However, no other data was provided. When data was requested from administrators, information was provided that showed only one program had compiled performance data at the advanced level. Documents showed that the complete Program Assessment and Evaluation

System (PAES) was to be implemented in 2008. There was not clear alignment to specialty area standards or accreditation for the school personnel programs. An examination of PAES showed a little data for Administrative Services. The data on how well prepared candidates were for modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity was rated at 83 percent for 2004 and 93 percent for 2005. The ratings in Tier I and Tier II were 91 percent for 2004 and 99 percent for 2005.

Programs in Librarianship, Dual Language Development and Psychology had partially addressed specialty standards. For example, content knowledge of the Dual Language Development program was assessed using a rubric with 22 candidates. It showed that in the area of language-related policy the mean score was 9.5 or 96 percent; on the research question the possible score was 5 and the candidates' mean score was 4.8 or 96 percent. For data collection the possible score was 5 with a mean score of 4.76 or 95 percent. On discussion of findings, a mean score of 20 was earned in a possible score of 20. In the group of 22, the mean score was 55 of a possible 60. The data suggest that the dual language students had developed knowledge related to research; however, no other performance data was analyzed related to student learning outcomes for the dual language program. For the librarianship program, analysis of content was measured through information and ideas such as literacy and ideas. In year one, candidates scored at 98 percent. This was the only data analyzed for content.

A survey of candidates' perceptions of development of professional knowledge and skills between 2002 and 2005 ranged from 4.59 to 4.47 candidates indicate they are highly successful.

The School Psychology program has accreditation from the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and chose to use this accreditation for the current merged review. This was one of the programs that provided limited summarized data.

Interviews with program coordinators and practicum supervisors indicated that the school personnel candidates had developed knowledge in the area. The lack of summarized performance data made it difficult to assess candidates' acquisition of adequate professional knowledge and skills. Moreover, when requested, the unit did not provide summarized data that was aligned to the student learning outcomes. According to the Institutional Report, course syllabi document professional knowledge and skills; however, no analysis of data was provided. A listing of courses was provided, but the data was insufficient to determine if other school personnel candidates had acquired professional knowledge and skills.

F. Dispositions

The unit conducted a survey of all candidates in fall 2006 that used 12 survey items on dispositions that were explicitly stated. Using a 4-point scale ranging from "not that important to "very important," candidates were to rank importance of dispositions to them and how well they felt their program prepared them on a 4-point scale from "not at all prepared" to "well prepared." The survey showed that 92 percent of candidates in all three types of programs at the initial level responded that the dispositions were all important or very important. On the other hand, when asked how well their program prepared them, responses were 91 percent or lower for all items. Fewer than 89 percent reported feeling adequately or well prepared on three items. This was the

only data that was collected for all three types of programs and summarized. The data was for one semester only. Elementary teacher candidates also complete a self-assessment of dispositions and reflect on their attitudes and habits. During the program candidates also demonstrate professional dispositions including 12 professional, legal and ethical obligations.

During student teaching candidates also undergo both a mid-point and formative assessment, and a final summative assessment on dispositions. While candidates in all initial programs are assessed in several ways on dispositions, little data has been summarized across programs.

A disposition survey based on 12 dispositions in the conceptual framework piloted in 2006 asks candidates to rate importance and how well they felt prepared. Ninety-two percent in all initial credential programs indicated dispositions were important or very important. Fewer than 80 percent felt that the program prepared them adequately or well for collaboration with community (64%); to promote school improvement for all students (7%); and for a rapidly changing, technologically-rich world (78%).

Data showed candidates demonstrate professional dispositions in course activities. For the Multiple Subject program, there was a rating of 3.91 on professional, legal and ethical obligations, and a rating for professional growth of 3.92. This was not assessed in spring 2006.

Master and student teachers rated candidates on six (6) dispositions for 2005-2006. For The Multiple Subject program, there was a range from 4.2 to 4.84 on a 5-point scale. Candidates who are not rated well are identified and their university supervisor works with them on areas to improve.

Summative data for Multiple Subject candidates from student teaching showed that candidates rated themselves on developing as professional educators for fall 2005 at 3.82 and for spring 2006 at 3.93 on a 4.0 scale. In the Single Subject program, a rubric was used to assess candidates; however, no data was summarized.

The Educational Specialist self ratings on commitment and responsibility, interpersonal skills and attitude toward learners for fall 2006 showed a range of 4.21-4.31 on a 5-point scale.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, cooperating teachers, internship supervisors, school administrators, and others suggest that candidates demonstrate the expected dispositions that are outlined in the programs.

Surveys of employers' rating of candidates indicated that employers rated graduates better prepared than the graduates rated themselves. On a survey, 69 percent of candidates in the initial" program indicated they were well or adequately prepared to know about resources in the school and community for at-risk students and families.

Data indicate that candidates at the initial level have developed appropriate dispositions for entry into the profession.

G. Student learning for teacher candidates

A study was conducted between 1999-2000 and 2002-2003 to determine the effectiveness and perception of Educational Specialists. Interviews and classroom observations were conducted for 15 candidates. The mean rating for all candidates on classroom environment was 3.06, which was proficient on domain of instruction. The mean was 2.88, which was considered an area of need. The single subject program aggregated had a mean of 3.27-3.47, which suggested that candidates have a substantial impact on student learning. 3.85 for fall 2005.

For the same group for spring 2006, impact on student learning was assessed at 3.17-3.25 on a scale of 4.0. Student teacher supervisors perceive that candidates have a significant impact on student learning.

Comparison of initial program candidates and program graduates showed that in looking back candidates perceived they were better prepared on all dimension than did graduates at the end of their first year of teaching.

Interviews of faculty, students and partners from the schools indicated that candidates had a positive impact on student learning.

Data suggest that candidates at the initial level have a positive impact on student learning.

H. Student learning for other school personnel

There was no summarized data for student learning for other school personnel. Although the Institutional Report indicated that candidates in advanced programs demonstrate their ability to impact student learning in coursework, practicum experiences, and case student projects, there was no data summarized. For example, an examination of the PAES for the Dual Language Development program showed that action research has documented that 12 of 15 completed studies, which increased student performance, but no summarized data was provided.

Data was not available to indicate if other school personnel impacted student learning.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Performance data for candidates at the initial level was collected and summarized from key assessments such as standardized tests, surveys, and interviews. Performance data had been summarized and analyzed to demonstrate that candidates had acquired content, content pedagogical, professional and pedagogical knowledge. In addition, the data from key assessments showed that candidates had developed appropriate dispositions and could positively impact student learning. Performance data for candidates at the advanced level was uneven in all areas. Some programs had adequate data in some areas while other programs had no data. For example, Early Childhood had collected and analyzed some data for one semester. For other school personnel, there was not consistent collection of data for programs. While students learning outcomes had been identified, there was no data summarized across programs. Three programs had collected limited data. Data was not adequate to make judgments about the adequacy of candidates.

Recommendation: Initial Met

Advanced: Not met

Areas for Improvement:

Advanced

New: Candidates proficiencies are not consistently identified and assessed in all advanced programs

Rationale: Some of the program at the advanced level had not identified student learning outcomes or proficiencies. A majority of the program had not assess candidates using the learning outcomes. Data collection was not linked clearly to the key assessments.

Advanced

New: Key assessments aligned to these proficiencies are not available in all advanced programs.

Rationale: Materials provided for the team did not list key assessments for all programs. For example, most programs used comprehensive examinations and follow-up surveys; however, all programs did not have key assessment that evaluated candidates' content knowledge, dispositions or impact on student learning

Advanced

New: Performance data on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions developed in advanced programs was not available for all programs

Rationale: Programs at the advanced level had not collected performance data on the knowledge skills and dispositions described by the unit as student learning outcomes. Surveys had been distributed and collected for some programs that ask candidates about their perceptions of their preparation. Practicum results were compiled based on the number of individuals who successfully completed the internship.

Advanced

New: Assessments in advanced programs are not aligned to candidate proficiencies.

Rationale: The assessment in the advanced programs was not aligned to learning outcomes or the conceptual framework. Data was collected; however, it was not possible to determine if candidates has mastered specific proficiencies because they were not aligned. Data presented was not presented in terms of proficiencies. For example, comprehensive examinations were reported based on the number of students who took the examination and the number who passes. Data was not reported in terms of proficiencies or student learning outcomes.

Advanced

New: Performance data for candidates in advanced programs have not been summarized and aggregated across all programs.

Rationale: There were three programs in other school personnel that had summarized limited data on candidates' performance. Advanced programs for teaching had summarized limited data for each individual program. Examination of the Program Assessment and Evaluation System (PAES) showed data on individual programs. However, the unit had not summarized performance data for candidates across all programs at the advanced level.

State Team Decision: Standard Met

Rationale: The state requirement for meeting this standard is substantially different from that of NCATE. At present, the state standard requires that candidates are assessed within each program as defined by the appropriate program standards. It was judged that initial and advanced programs meet CTC requirements for Standard 1.

STANDARD 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

Levels: Initial and Advanced

To varying degrees, the unit has designed and begun to implement an assessment system for collecting and analyzing data on (1) applicant qualifications, (2) candidate and graduate performance, and (3) unit operations with respect to 16 initial and advanced programs in the unit:

- Three initial programs for teachers in elementary education (Multiple Subject), secondary education (Single Subject), and special education (Educational Specialist, Level I)
- Thirteen advanced programs, including eight for teachers in English as a second language (dual language development), early childhood education, curriculum and instruction, reading, special education (Educational Specialist, Level II), communicative disorders, adapted physical education, and educational psychology; and five additional advanced programs for other school professionals in educational administration, counseling, school psychology, educational technology, and library media.

A. Assessment System

Development of the unit's assessment system began in 2001-02 following the last NCATE visit, which was based on the "old" NCATE standards. This visit is, therefore, the unit's first visit based on the NCATE 2000 standards, which focus intensely on candidate performance and a unit's assessment system for candidate, program, and unit evaluation.

Responsibility for developing, implementing, managing, and using the unit's assessment system to improve program and unit operations rests with its Strategic Planning Committee, which consists of a dozen individuals and includes faculty members, one unit administrator, a candidate, a staff member, and one P-12 school representative. Beyond the members of the Strategic Planning Committee, other faculty in the unit have been involved in developing the assessment system primarily in their individual programs. Development of the system has not directly involved members of the unit's Teacher Education Committee, Graduate Study Committee, or Faculty Council, nor has it involved any other members of the off-campus professional education community.

Major activities in development of the unit assessment system since 2001-02 have included approval of the unit's Strategic Planning Document and initial development of "indicator surveys" that year; approval of a template for documenting assessment and evaluation activities and products in notebooks for each program (the PAES or Program Assessment and Evaluation System template) in 2002-03; review and refinement of the unit's conceptual framework between 2004 and 2006; and description of the current assessment system and collection of relevant materials in preparation for this combined NCATE/CCTC joint visit.

Even though development of the unit assessment system has been going on for more than five years, there is not yet a single document that comprehensively describes its purposes, components, frameworks, requirements, instruments, schedules, etc. Team members were informed that the current best description of the assessment system is the text written for Standard 2 in the IR. Drawing on that document, the unit's Strategic Planning Document, the PAES notebooks for all sixteen programs, and information on the unit's webpage, here are the key components in the assessment system's design as it has evolved to this point:

1. The overall conceptualization that describes how the assessment system relates to the unit's conceptual framework, the state's "common standards" for professional education programs, and the six NCATE Standards is depicted in Figure 2.02 (page 27) in the IR. Absent from this conceptualization is any explicit linkage of the unit's conceptual framework to the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that are now required by the institution and that will drive candidate assessment in the future or to national standards for professional education programs, like the INTASC standards for beginning teachers, the NBPTS standards for experienced teachers, the standards of accrediting agencies, or the standards of NCATE-approved specialized professional associations (SPAs).
2. Operationally, the assessment system is program-based, rather than unit-based. Each program is expected to produce and maintain one or more notebooks that document (section by section) how the program engages in candidate assessment (Sections IA-IF) and program evaluation (Sections IIA-IIH). A summary of the content in each of these sections is the most efficient way to describe the content of the unit's current assessment system:
 - IA: Description and summary of the program's learning outcomes (SLOs, program-developed lists of knowledge, skills, and dispositions, or state expectations like the California Teaching Performance Expectations for elementary and secondary education programs)
 - IB: A description of how students are assessed at entry, during, and exit from programs
 - IC: Assessment instruments
 - ID: Data linked to student learning outcomes at entry, during, and exit from programs
 - IE: Decision rules and data points for determining candidate performance at key points
 - IF: Documentation of formal candidate complaints and documentation of results
 - IIA: Description and summary of how program evaluations are conducted
 - IIB: Documentation of internal and external program reviews and responses to the reviews
 - IIC: Evidence of graduates' impact on students
 - IID: Evidence of graduates' impact on their professional communities
 - IIE: Internal and external instruments for evaluating programs
 - IIF: Data displays and analyses of program evaluation data
 - IIG: Decisions and actions taken as a result of evaluation analyses

IIIH: Evidence of regular and part-time faculty review of data on their performance and plans for improvement

Of the two major kinds of assessment documented in the notebooks—assessment of candidate performance and evaluation of program effectiveness—the former has been a special focus of attention during the past year or two, but the latter is much more robust in terms of data collected and used during the past several years to make decisions.

3. The system calls for each program to conduct key assessments at four transition points in initial programs (admission, advancement to student teaching, completion of student teaching, and program completion) and four comparable transition points in advanced programs (admission, advancement to candidacy, culminating experience, and degree awarded or recommended). While the unit's three (3) initial programs have adopted the four initial program transition points defined by the assessment system, the 13 advanced programs have not adopted consistently the four advanced program transition points defined for them. Some have identified three key transition points, others five, six, or seven, and still others have not yet identified any key transition points; rather, they have listed the steps that a candidate takes as he or she progresses from admission to graduation. Because the expected framework of transition points has not been systematically adopted and implemented throughout the unit, it is difficult to aggregate or summarize data across programs at any one common transition point.
4. The unit's 16 programs have also not consistently identified a relatively small number of key measures (i.e., 6-8) that spread across each program's four defined transition points. While this has been done in the unit's three (3) initial programs in teacher education, it has not consistently been done in all of the unit's 13 advanced programs. Identifying a small number of key measures has been most successfully done in those advanced programs that attend to the requirements of national specialized associations (e.g., school psychology, communicative disorders, library media) and least successfully in programs that do not attend to national standards. Failure to identify 6-8 key measures that cut across four common transition points has further inhibited the ability of the unit to aggregate or summarize data across multiple programs or for the unit as a whole.
5. While Figure 2.02 in the IR suggests that the assessment system collects candidate performance data directly related to the unit's conceptual framework themes, CCTC common standards, and NCATE standards, programs currently collect data primarily (although not always explicitly) in terms of their SLOs. Identifying these SLOs was an institutional requirement placed on virtually all programs last year in order to prepare the institution for a WASC accreditation visit in 2009-10. The first step in the process called for programs to identify their SLOs; the second step calls for them to phase in collecting data on their SLOs during the next two or three years. Virtually all programs at both initial and advanced levels have identified a small number of SLOs (from 5-11) that are prominently listed in their PAES notebooks and that will increasingly drive the development of candidate performance measures in programs.

Unfortunately, while faculty assert that the SLOs have been derived from the unit's conceptual framework, the linkage between the two is much more implied than explicit, and no program has described in narrative, outline, or chart form exactly how its SLOs align with the unit's conceptual framework themes. As a consequence, it is not currently possible for any program in the unit to provide candidate performance data on the conceptual framework themes, and it is thus not possible to generate unit-wide data on the themes.

Similarly, faculty have not explicitly related the SLOs to the five NCATE Standard 1 Elements for initial programs (content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and student learning), the four NCATE Standard 1 Elements for advanced programs (content knowledge, professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and student learning), or the first Element in Standard 4 (ability to work with diverse students). As a consequence, it is not currently possible for each program in the unit to provide candidate performance data directly linked to NCATE expectations. The absence of these data made the team's decision making on Standard 1 especially challenging, and it required the team to ask the unit to provide these data several times during the visit.

In effect, without future efforts to do so, the unit's current assessment system will generate data related to the state's Teaching Performance Expectations in elementary and secondary education, state expectations in special education, and sets of SLOs defined in its 13 advanced programs, but it will not enable the unit to aggregate or summarize data across programs in terms of either its six conceptual framework themes or candidate performance expectations defined in NCATE Standards 1 and 4.

6. Well documented in Sections IB and IC of virtually every program's PAES notebook are several instruments for assessing candidate performance at different stages in the program, as well as rubrics or scoring guides that define points on the rating scales used for these instruments, but these instruments are not aligned with conceptual framework themes or with NCATE categories of knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

B. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Except in broad outlines described in the unit's Strategic Planning Document and in Table 2.02 in the IR Tables & Figures, which lists 11 activities planned between now and 2010, there is not a detailed multi-year timeline of activities for continuing to design the assessment system, implement its procedures for collecting, storing, aggregating, and reporting data to relevant stakeholders, and then using these data to improve both programs and unit operations. To varying degrees, these activities are certainly going on at a program level, but they are not consistent, systematic, organized, and well-coordinated across programs. As one unit representative observed, the unit is a "confederation" of programs, and the assessment system is more "distributive" than centralized.

As a consequence, the quantity and quality of candidate performance data currently available in programs and thus across the unit are very uneven, and they range from considerable in the unit's

initial programs in elementary, secondary, and special education (thanks to mandated licensure tests, mandated teaching performance assessments, and mandated system-wide exit and follow-up surveys of candidates, cooperating teachers, graduates, and their employers) and in its advanced programs in school psychology, library media, and communicative disorders (thanks to the requirements for national program approval and accreditation) to some, little, or none in the unit's other advanced programs. All advanced programs in the unit do not have at least two semesters of candidate performance data, an expectation of NCATE for units reviewed in 2006-07.

To date, candidate performance data have been collected exclusively at the program level, and these data have not been aggregated or summarized and then reported for either clusters of programs or for the unit as a whole. For instance, the unit has not yet developed summaries of licensure test results (not just pass rates, but score ranges and item analyses), performance on Teaching Performance Assessment tasks related to knowledge, skills, and dispositions in initial teacher education programs, GPAs in content courses, measures of candidates' ability to work with diverse students or their impact on student learning, or common assessments of their performance in culminating field experiences across different programs.

Team members were able to find only two examples of aggregated candidate performance data across multiple years:

1. Exit data from a sample of elementary, secondary, and special education candidates and their cooperating teachers collected by the CSU system; and
2. One-year follow-up data from a sample of elementary, secondary, and special education graduates and their employers collected by the CSU system.

One other example of unit-wide candidate performance data available to the team was the results of a pilot survey conducted in fall 2006 on 12 professional dispositions that have been proposed as unit-wide dispositions relevant to all candidates in all programs. The survey was essentially a face validity study conducted among a sample of 519 candidates (397 of whom responded) from all programs in the unit to determine (1) how important the candidates think it is "to have the disposition" and (2) how well their program "prepared [them] to promote" the disposition among all students. The unit has not yet devised a way to actually assess whether or not these 12 dispositions are demonstrated among candidates at one or more times in their programs, but it has taken the first step toward developing a unit-wide measure of an important competence.

On balance, the unit does not at this point have a detailed "management plan" for summarizing and analyzing data at the unit level—a plan that describes how the data will be formatted for analysis, how often it will be aggregated/summarized and analyzed, whose responsibility this will be, how the results of the analysis will be reported and used, etc.

In contrast to this relative paucity of candidate performance data at program and unit levels, both programs and the unit have generated considerable data during the past four or five years about program quality and effectiveness, and these data have consistently been used to modify programs and improve unit operations. Most of these data have been collected at the program level, where they have been systematically analyzed and used to modify programs. Other data

have been collected at the unit level by means of surveys—primarily by the Strategic Planning Committee—and then used to modify unit operations. For instance, minutes of the Committee’s meetings this year document their use of surveys to assess faculty use of technology, the unit’s attention to issues of diversity, the quality of advising in the unit, and the usefulness of faculty meetings. As seven of the 14 sections of the PAES notebooks document, faculty in virtually all programs make a conscious and deliberate effort to collect and use program evaluation data to improve their programs.

In terms of the psychometric quality of the unit’s assessment measures and procedures, a concerted effort has not yet been made to ensure that they are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. As in most institutions, the performance of student teachers in initial programs and interns in advanced programs are assessed by at least two individuals, e.g., a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor, or a site supervisor and a CSU LB faculty member. Similarly, the CSU exit and follow-up surveys solicit information from two individuals, including the candidate or graduate and a cooperating teacher or employer. And most instruments used by instructors in their courses or by observers in field settings have fairly well developed rubrics or scoring guides that increase consistency and reliability for evaluating assignments, work samples, research projects, classroom performance, etc. In addition, one pilot study was conducted this year to unpack the assessment instrument used in student teaching and the data it generates in order to analyze response rates and their reliability. Overall, however, the unit has not yet generated sufficient data to focus explicitly, systematically, and comprehensively on psychometric issues at either program or unit level. Perhaps for the same reason, it has not yet determined whether the key assessments used to admit candidates to programs are reliable and valid predictors of candidate success.

Similarly, the unit has not devised a rich array of instruments and procedures within and across programs to assess the impact that candidates and graduates have on P-12 learners and/or P-12 learning environments. Some of this kind of assessment does occur in student teaching in the unit’s initial programs; and, by means of three course-based case studies, the unit’s school psychology program does a good job of assessing the impact that its candidates have on P-12 learners. But in most of the unit’s advanced programs, faculty are still wrestling with the challenge of devising acceptable and meaningful ways to assess the impact their candidates have on P-12 learning during their programs (especially during their culminating field experiences) and in their first or second year after graduation.

At this point, technologies used to support the unit’s assessment system are specific to each program. They include Word tables, Excel spreadsheets, applications of FileMaker Pro, and comparable software. Two of the 16 programs (the elementary education program at the initial level and the early childhood education program at the advanced level) have just begun to use TaskStream this year for monitoring candidate performance on “signature assignments” in some courses. But the unit has not yet designed and adopted a comprehensive software and technology for its assessment system, one that will support aggregating and summarizing program data to the unit level. This will certainly be an important agenda item for the unit’s new Assessment Coordinator, who will begin his appointment this summer.

Section F of each PAES notebook provides extensive documentation of how formal candidate complaints are handled and resolved and of how and where records of these cases are maintained. The procedures are clear and complete.

C. Use of Data for Program Improvement

As indicated above, Sections IIA, IIB, and IID-IIH in the PAES notebook for each program provide ample evidence that faculty in virtually all 16 professional education programs in the unit collect and use data to improve their programs. Most of these data are collected by means of surveys; other data are collected during meetings of program advisory groups. Virtually all programs have regular procedures whereby faculty meet to examine program evaluation data and consider possible corrective or improvement actions based on data.

As also indicated above, the unit's Strategic Planning Committee has initiated several surveys in the past year to assess the status of different aspects of unit operations, e.g., faculty use of technology, candidate advisement, unit attention to diversity, effectiveness of College faculty meetings, etc. These efforts are well documented in the minutes of the Committee.

Multiple examples of changes made in programs and the unit based on program evaluation data generated at both program and unit levels are presented on pages 40-43 of the IR.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The design for the unit's assessment system embraces all 16 initial and advanced programs in the unit, but it has not been consistently implemented in all these programs, especially at the advanced level. Among the unit's programs, evidence that faculty collect, store, aggregate to some extent, and use information about candidate qualifications and performance to make improvements within programs is greatest in two of the unit's three initial programs (elementary and secondary education) and in three of its 13 advanced programs (school psychology, communicative disorders, and library media). As a consequence of this uneven implementation and use of data at program levels, it is equally true that the unit has not yet developed and implemented systematic procedures for aggregating or summarizing data across programs at either the initial or advanced levels, or across all programs in the unit. To date, collection and use of data to make informed decisions about programs and unit operations have been much more successful with respect to program evaluation than candidate performance. The unit has not yet developed procedures or systematically conducted studies for ensuring the psychometric integrity of its assessment measures.

Recommendation: Met at the Initial Level, but Not Met at the Advanced Level

Areas for Improvement:

New: Assessments are not explicitly aligned to the unit's conceptual framework themes, the categories of knowledge, skills, and dispositions defined in NCATE standards, or national professional standards. (Initial and Advanced)

Rationale: Given institutional mandates that now require programs to identify and assess Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), these SLOs are now driving assessment within programs. To date, however, the SLOs in each program have not been explicitly aligned to the unit's six conceptual framework themes, the knowledge, skill, and disposition expectations of NCATE, or the standards of national professional associations and relevant accrediting agencies.

Programs have not consistently identified a small number of assessment instruments (6-8) at the four transition points defined by the assessment system. (Advanced)

Rationale: Advanced programs have not consistently adopted the four key transition points defined for advanced programs by the assessment system, nor have they focused their candidate performance assessment activities on a small number (6-8) of key assessment measures that are spread across the four transition points.

All programs do not have at least two semesters of candidate performance data. (Advanced)

Rationale: Some programs have two or three years of data, others have two semesters of data, and some have none.

The unit does not have a management plan for aggregating or summarizing candidate performance data across programs. (Initial and Advanced)

Rationale: This kind of plan has not been developed for either aggregating candidate performance data that can be aggregated (e.g., licensure test results, scores on Teaching Performance Assessment Tasks) or for summarizing candidate performance data across multiple programs that use the same kind of measures (e.g., field experience ratings, culminating research projects, comprehensive examinations).

The unit cannot ensure that its assessment methods and instruments are fair, accurate, consistent, free of bias, and good predictors of candidate success. (Initial and Advanced)

Rationale: With exception of one or two informal pilot projects shared with team members during the visit, it appears that the unit has not yet initiated systematic and comprehensive procedures at either program or unit levels to engage in these activities.

State Team Decision: Standard Met

Rationale: The state requirement for meeting this standard is substantially different from that of NCATE. At present, the state standard requires that designated stakeholders involves program participants, graduates and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of courses and field experiences that lead to substantive improvement in credential programs. It was judged that initial and advanced programs meet CTC requirements at the program level.

STANDARD 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

A. Collaboration between unit and school partners

Levels: Initial and Advanced Programs

School partners are involved in the design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit's field and clinical experiences. Programs are in frequent communication with districts and schools through the program coordinators, fieldwork coordinators, university supervisors, and administrative staff in program offices.

California State University, Long Beach is nationally recognized for its strong P-16 collaboration, particularly the Long Beach Education Partnership (LBEP). The partnership brought together business and industry, the three major educational institutions (CSU Long Beach, Long Beach City College, and Long Beach Unified School District), and city government in a series of initiatives, among them reform of teacher preparation in the unit that saw development of a new undergraduate major that "blended" liberal studies course work with professional preparation leading to both a BA degree and an elementary teaching credential. The Integrated Teacher Education Program (ITEP) is now the primary means by which candidates enter elementary credential program, and is the largest undergraduate major on campus.

The Service Experiences for ReVitalizing Education Program (SERVE) is a long-term successful partnership initiative that also grew out of the LBEP. Housed in the College, SERVE places undergraduates as early as the freshman year in school sites where they learn about the realities of urban classrooms and the needs of the diverse P-12 student population. Approximately 1300 SERVE interns annually work with students individually and in small groups to provide academic support to public school students who are at-risk in reading or mathematics. As per the Director, candidates assess their career goals and receive on-going evaluations and support through this program.

In interviewing the University Teacher Preparation Committee, it was pointed out that each program has an advisory group that meets at least annually, and in some cases more often. These advisory boards, committees, or councils provide opportunities for the exchange of ideas, information, concerns and feedback between programs. They have been instrumental in revising a student teaching or clinical practice evaluation form along with giving input on new content to include in a course that's being revised.

One of the structured ways the initial teacher preparation programs collaborate with cooperating districts is through District Partner Meetings held on campus periodically. These meetings are attended by credential program coordinators, an associate dean, the directors of the Credential Center and Career Services, district assistant superintendents for Human Resources, and district

personnel responsible for liaising with the credential programs for placing student teachers. Issues concerning early fieldwork, student teaching, credentialing, and recruitment are addressed.

Patterns of collaboration for placing student teachers and clinical practitioners vary with district preferences. Some districts prefer that programs work through a specific person in the district office while other districts permit programs to work directly with school sites. Linkages with clinicians, district-employed supervising teachers and cooperating teachers for early field experiences and master teachers for student teaching are the responsibility of each program.

Candidates in the advanced programs are usually working full-time in a school and fieldwork is the responsibility of the program coordinator and individual course instructor.

B. Design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice

Initial Programs

Candidates in all initial teacher preparation programs have field experiences embedded in their course work. The culminating field experience, student teaching, occurs at the end of the program after all course work is completed. Each program has a 45 hour pre-program fieldwork requirement mandated by the CSU system. State and professional standards guide programs in the kinds of field experiences candidates should have, but the actual number of fieldwork hours is determined by each program

In early fieldwork, candidates engage in such activities as observation of a variety of veteran teachers, collecting data on schools, classrooms, and students, developing classroom management plans, writing unit and lesson plans, and co-teaching and independent teaching. Student teaching is an all day, five days per week assignment with a master teacher in which the candidate gradually assumes greater responsibility for the total instructional program in the class.

According to the data provided, the table below shows the field experiences and clinical practice required in each initial program.

Field Experience and Clinical Practice in Unit Programs: (initial)

Program	Early Field Experience	Clinical Field Experience	Activities Completed	Total Hours
Single Subject	EDSS 300—45 hrs EDSE 435—15 hrs EDSE 436—15 hrs EDSE 457 – 15 hrs EDSE 450 – 15 hrs Total hours: 105	Traditional Student Teaching Total hours: 500	Observational journals, reflective writing, school study project, implement lesson plans, videotape and critique themselves teaching, case study of an English learner, CTPA Tasks 1-3	605

Program	Early Field Experience	Clinical Field Experience	Activities Completed	Total Hours
Multiple Subject	EDEL 380 – 45 hrs EDEL 413 – 10 hrs EDEL 431 – 10 hrs EDEL 442 – 10 hrs EDEL 452 – 10 hrs EDEL 462 – 10 hrs EDEL 472 – 10 hrs EDEL 475 – 10 hrs Total hours: 115	Traditional Student Teaching or Intern Student Teaching Total hours: 600	Conduct field-based instructional activities, prepare lesson plans, develop a unit of instruction, complete a case study, prepare an instructional plan for a child, keep field-based observational records or journals, write reflections, complete informal assessments, complete a school/community study, complete TPA Tasks 1-3	715
Education Specialist Level I	EDSP 350 – 6 hrs EDSP 454 – 3 hrs EDSP 480 – 45 hrs EDP 405 – 8 hrs EDSP 564 – 10 hrs EDEL 452 – 10 hrs EDEL 462 – 10 hrs EDSP 567 – 8 hrs EDSP 569 – 3 hrs Total hours: 61	Traditional student teachers gradually take over the responsibility for planning and teaching. Intern teachers – teachers of record; assume all responsibilities. Total hours: 560-1120	Write reflective papers, complete a case study, monitor student progress, develop and implement a behavioral and literacy intervention, create and implement lesson plans for students, etc. Maintain a field experience log in the Education Specialist Program portfolio: Total hours: 61 .	621- 1181

All field experiences are devoted to providing opportunities for candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions as a life-long learner through professional growth and social responsibility.

The unit systematically ensures that candidates have opportunities to use technology as an instructional tool during field experiences or clinical practice. On-campus classes are taught using information technology. Some candidates reported frustration during field experiences when technology in their field setting was less current and less abundant than what they were using during coursework.

In all three preparation programs, many school-based teachers who serve as master teachers or intern site support teachers have now completed California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST) training as part of their participation in their district-sponsored Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA)/Induction Program.

Advanced Programs

Candidates in the advanced programs are already practicing teachers; clinical experiences are related to their own school setting and are an integral part of each course.

The table below shows the kind of field experiences in which candidates in advanced programs for teachers and programs for other school personnel participate. In each field experience, the

candidates gradually take on greater professional responsibility as they progress through the program.

Field Experience and Clinical Practice in Unit Programs: (Advanced)

Program	Early Field Experiences	Clinical Field Experiences	Activities Completed	Total Hours
Education Specialist Level II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Adapted Physical Education	KIN 489: 45 hrs KIN 489A: 45 hrs Total hours: 90	Traditional Student Teaching assignment with an Itinerant APE Specialist Total hours: 500	Develop and implement assessments reports, individualized education programs (IEP), unit and lesson plans. Plan, teach, videotape, evaluate/code and teacher reflection of APE instruction.	590
School Counseling	COUN 506: 20 hrs COUN 607: 65 hrs COUN 606: 20 hrs COUN 513: 10 hrs COUN 638: 30 hrs Total hours: 145+	COUN 643A: School Counseling Field Work -300 COUN 644A: Advanced School Counseling Field Work – 300 Total hours: 600	Observe at a school site, shadow a credentialed school counselor, develop a map of school-based community resources, participate in direct counseling services to P-12 students and parents under the supervision of the practicum instructor, and practice micro- and group counseling skills.	745
Educational Administration Tier I	Course related field experience (70 hours) Introductory Field Experience (100 hours) Total hours: 170	Culminating Field Experience: EDAD 680 Total hours: 120	Mentor beginning teachers, chair a site leadership team, analyze student achievement data, serve on employee selection panels, supervise and evaluate an after-school academic intervention program, develop school technology plans, write grants, and conduct parent conferences, create a portfolio of work artifacts and keep a reflective journal.	290
Reading Programs	EDRG 559: 20 hrs Total hours: 20	EDRG 651: 10 hrs Total hours: 10	Intervention Plan, reflections on the intervention project, 2 videotaped lessons and SIOP analysis, peer SIOP analysis and classroom observation. Conduct battery of assessments, analyze assessment data, design intervention plan, and prepare final case study report.	30
Library Media Teacher Services	LI510: 15-20 hrs LI520: 10 hrs LI530A: 7 hrs LI530B: 13 hrs LI540: 5 hrs LI550: 30-35 hrs LI570: 10-15 hrs EDC1625: 15-20 Total hours: 105-125	LI580 Field Experience Total hours: 120	Collaboratively design and deliver lesson, do project focused on information access and delivery, do program administration-based project, work alongside site LMT; Create an e-portfolio of evidence that demonstrates that the candidate meets LMT standards.	225-245

Field Experience and Clinical Practice in Unit Programs: (Advanced) (continued)

School Psychology	EDP405: 8 hrs EDP517: 23 hrs EDP524: 54 hrs EDP525: 50 hrs EDP528: 8 hrs EDP560: 20 hrs EDP579: 41 hrs EDP641A: 150 hrs EDP641B: 150 hrs Total hours: 454	Final fieldwork EDP527: 35 hrs EDP536: 15 hrs EDP642A: 600 hrs EDP642B: 600 hrs Total hours: 1250	Maintain a field experience log, evaluate a PreK-12 student with a moderate to severe disability; conduct at least one psycho educational evaluation for a student with a low-incidence disability; engage in two consultation projects; work with at least one student exhibiting behavior/adjustment problems and collaborate with his/her teacher and parent to improve student behavior.	1704
Clinical Rehabilitative Services	CD483: 25 hrs CD669A, D, C, F, G, J, L: 375 hrs. Total hours: 400	CD686A Externship Total hours: 100+	Candidates engage in the duties of a Speech-Language Pathologist in a public school under the direct supervision of a CRS and ASHA certified.	500+

Field experiences and clinical experiences for advanced candidates vary by programs.

All programs plan and implement supervision and evaluation of the culminating field experience consistent with the candidate proficiencies in the Conceptual Framework, state standards, and standards of professional organizations. A master teacher, master counselor, and master clinician, etc. is provided by the school and the program provides a university supervisor. A formative and a summative evaluation of the candidate are done by the master practitioner and university supervisor.

C. Candidates' development and demonstration of knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn

Levels: Initial and Advanced

During the summer and fall 2006, 1,439 initial teacher preparation candidates were placed in field experiences and credentials were granted. Two hundred forty-nine (249) advanced teacher preparation and other school personnel candidates were placed in field experiences and credentials were granted.

Initial teacher preparation programs and advanced teacher preparation programs offer a progressive set of authentic assessments through required coursework and field experiences. Candidates receive feedback from course instructors, advisors, and program coordinators as they progress through the program. A strong point of the unit is the fast response and support given to candidates throughout the program. Some programs use portfolio reviews or signature assignments as a method to systematically assess candidates and to identify those who are having difficulty progressing through program requirements. The Credential Center provides evaluations of initial and advanced candidates at key transition points that help programs monitor candidate progress on such benchmarks as passage of benchmark courses, grade point average, character clearance, and so on.

Time for reflection and feedback is incorporated into the field experiences and clinical practice. During initial field placements, candidates do reflections and portfolios based on their job shadowing. During their second and third field placements, candidates regularly sit down with

their mentors, as well as their cooperating teachers, for reflection. They also participate in seminars several times per year.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit assures collaboration in the development of field experiences and evaluation of candidates in their field experiences assessment. All initial candidates complete field experiences at various stages of their program. All advanced candidates do some type of field experience. Candidates in initial and advanced teaching and other school personnel programs develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Recommendation: Met at the initial and advanced levels

Areas for Improvement: None

Removed: At the initial level, the Single Subject programs are inconsistent in the regularity with which university supervisors are evaluated

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

Levels: Initial and Advanced

A. Design, implementation and evaluation of curriculum and experiences

Recently, the city of Long Beach, California was identified as the “most diverse city” in the United States. On May 1, 2007, UCSLB received notification from *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*, that the institution was one of the top 100 minority student degree producers among America’s community colleges and undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools. It is within this context that the CSULB professional education unit is situated.

The UCSLB conceptual framework articulates strong commitment to diversity. Social Responsibility is one of three key themes used to frame the conceptual framework (the other two themes are lifelong learning and professional growth). The unit specifies the following components of the social responsibility theme:

- Pursuit of school improvement and equitable achievement for all students
- Value diversity, different points of view and global perspectives
- Prepare socially responsible leaders
- Forge partnerships with community-based organizations
- Contribute to community service learning
- Serve and collaborate with other educators and the community

The mission statement which accompanies the aforementioned three themes includes another key reference to diversity when it declares a commitment to “valuing diversity and preparing students for a diverse world.” Support for this assertion broadly defines human diversity to include cultural, linguistic, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, intellectual abilities, physical abilities, personality, learning styles, and socio-economic dimensions. The description also identifies several key issues: knowledge base, advocacy for all students, equity of educational opportunity, and empowerment. Special attention is given to the educational needs of second language learners. Two of the twelve unit-wide dispositions, which candidates are expected to develop and demonstrate, are: (a) “valuing diversity among students”; and (b) “preparing students for a diverse world.”

Consistently across both initial and advanced programs, required coursework and field experiences suggest a strong commitment to preparing teaching candidates in a manner that values diversity and provides the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for effectively teaching diverse groups of students. In the case of some programs, diversity permeates all courses and field experiences. For example, virtually every course and field experience in the Multiple Subject Credential Program (as evidenced in the course syllabi) includes readings, activities, and/or assignments that explicitly address diversity. The format for the lesson plans

written in methods and practicum courses consistently require candidates to identify curriculum differentiation strategies appropriate for English language learners. Interviews with graduates and also with current students in the Multiple Subject Credential Program confirmed that diversity was consistently stressed. In other programs, diversity is the obvious emphasis in a specific course (or courses). At the advanced program level, the Tier I Educational Administration Program includes two specific courses (EDAD 549: Urban Schools and the Community—Policy, Political, and Social Issues and EDAD 544: Legal Aspects of education—Implications and Applications) which are significantly or primarily focused on diversity-related issues. Finally, diversity is a program-wide committee for some programs. The Clinical Rehabilitative Services Program offers a “linguistically different program” that prepares speech pathology candidates for working with P-12 students and families whose first language is not English. Another example of this is the recently created MAED: Dual Language Development Program

Interviews with current teaching candidates and program graduates triangulated evidence from the Institutional Report and data found in the exhibit room; the institution’s success at teaching them about diversity and preparing them to work with diverse groups of P-12 students was impressive. In three different interviews, 100% of 45 teaching candidates believed that CSULB had both taught them about diversity and prepared them for working with diverse groups of learners. Teaching candidates cited many specific examples of how/where this preparation occurred: (a) in general studies and prerequisite courses; (b) in professional education courses; (c) in early field experiences – including the SERVE Program; (d) in student teaching/internships; (e) in special workshops or events sponsored by the College of Education or other CSULB entities/organizations; (f) in community-sponsored activities; and (g) from the diverse group of students and faculty that are a part of the CSULB community. Specific comments shared by teaching candidates were illuminating:

- “There is a wide array of activities both on and off the campus that address diversity. These opportunities go beyond awareness; they result in acceptance and celebration of diversity.”
- “There is a campus event tomorrow that focuses on sexual preference-related issues.”
- “In every course and every chapter we discuss multicultural issues. That is awesome.” (Multiple Subject Program Student)
- “Many prerequisite and general studies courses expose us to diversity. One of my courses was co-taught by four faculty members who were members of four different racial/cultural groups.”
- “Diversity is all around us. This is a diverse place. Field placements have to be in diverse places.”

Interview insights shared by hiring officials and mentor teachers also confirmed that teaching candidates are consistently well prepared for working in diverse P-12 settings.

At the initial certification level, various forms of data supported a conclusion that teaching candidates are knowledgeable about diversity and perform well when placed in diverse settings. Other items from the previously cited faculty survey (Table 4.01, IR Tables and Figures Std 4, p. 1-2) revealed strong support for candidates’ preparedness to teach in diverse settings; 88.95 of

responding CSULB faculty agreed or strongly agreed that teaching candidates learn to draw upon their P-12 students' background experiences and knowledge to develop effective instruction for all students while 86.8 percent of faculty believed that teaching candidates learn how to challenge and engage all of their students.

A second source of candidate performance data was the California Teacher Internship Study which gathered self-report data from graduates of the Educational Specialist I Program; 65 of 71 CSULB graduates felt "good or adequately prepared" to meet the instructional needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Another key data source was the California State system-wide data; Tables 4.1 and 4.2 summarize self-reported feedback provided by first year teachers who graduated from CSULB and performance assessment provided by the employment supervisors of first year teachers who graduated from CSULB. Consistently, more than 75 percent of graduates were adequately or well prepared for teaching diversity students. It is important to note that the mean scores for CSULB graduates consistently exceeded the mean scores across all CSU campuses:

Table 4.1: Preparedness of CSULB Graduates for working with Diverse Groups of P-12 Students – Self-Assessment of Program Graduates

2004-2005 CSULB <u>First Year Teaching Graduates'</u> Self-Perceptions: "How well prepared were you to..." (Percentage that were "well or adequately prepared")	All CSULB Grads N =251	Multi- Subject N = 140	Single Subject N = 102	Specialist Level 1 N = 16
Meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners.	69%	73%	60%	88%
Meet the instructional needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds.	77%	79%	73%	94%
Meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs.	60%	58%	59%	94%
Adhere to the principles of educational equity in the teaching of all students	82%	85%	76%	100%

Table 4.2: Preparedness of CSULB Graduates for working with Diverse Groups of P-12 Students – Employment Supervisors

2004-2005 CSULB <u>Employment Supervisor's</u> Perceptions of CSULB First-Year Teaching Graduates: "How well prepared were the First Year CSULB graduates for ..." (Percentage that were "well or adequately prepared")	All CSULB Grads N = 66	Multi- Subject N = 33	Single Subject N = 23	Specialist Level 1 N = 6
Meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners.	77%	78%	78%	67%
Meet the instructional needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds.	81%	82%	83%	67%
Meet the instructional needs of students with special learning needs.	76%	76%	77%	67%
Adhere to the principles of educational equity in the teaching of all students	85%	82%	91%	60%

Data Source: CSU System-wide Evaluation of Teacher Preparation (2005-2006)

The Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument, based on the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and used to assess the performance of teaching candidates in initial programs contains several items that are diversity-related. Successful completion of the experience requires a rating of “developing” for all criteria; “proficient” beginning practice is the target.

Teaching candidates from initial programs, who participated in campus interviews, firmly believed that they had received feedback directly relating to their understanding of diversity and also to their individual performance while working with diverse groups of students. Formal assessments of their performance included feedback on class assignments and performance instruments completed by university supervisor and/or mentor teachers.

Most advanced programs provided candidate performance and/or program assessment data that was diversity related.

The School Counseling program reported 2002-2006 data for Student Outcome #3: Graduates of the program will be able to articulate an understanding of key issues as they relate to counseling in school settings, including professional, ethical, and legal issues, and issues of diversity, including race/ethnicity, gender, disabilities, sexual orientation, and others. Using a 4 point scale, with a “4” rating meaning “much progress,” student responses consistently exceeded 3.40.

The NASP accredited School Psychology Program, in its most recent NASP accreditation visit was praised for its “sensitivity and commitment to human diversity. 2003-2006 data provided by site supervisors for practica and intern experiences consistently rated candidates at or above 3.40 on a 4 point scale (“4” = Outstanding) on items relating student diversity in development and learning; English language learners; racial/ethnic minorities; students with disabilities; gay, lesbian, and bi-sexual youth; and students raised in economic poverty.

A variety of diversity-related data was provided by the Educational Administration Program. In a Survey of Combined Masters’s/Preliminary Services Credential Program Graduates, program graduates self-reported very positive impressions concerning: (a) their preparedness for collaborating with families and community members; (b) skill and knowledge for working with diverse populations; (c) ability to apply knowledge of diverse learning styles and differentiated instruction strategies; (d) knowing how to shape a culture of high expectations for all students and for all subgroups of students; and (e) ability to promote equity, fairness, and respect among all members of the school community.

Similar data provided by the Reading, Early Childhood, and Curriculum and Instruction Programs was also consistently positive.

A majority of the data reported by advanced programs was relatively more oriented toward program assessment and comparatively less oriented toward candidate performance. Not all advanced programs provided specific data that addressed candidate performance or program assessment data for Standard Four.

B. Experiences working with diverse faculty

In the Institutional Report, CSULB acknowledged that the diversity of their faculty does not yet accurately mirror the diversity of the immediate region (68% of the residents of Los Angeles County and 48 percent of the residents of Orange County are identified as non-white). Still, the level of diversity of faculty is significant. In 2005-2006, 34 percent of the full-time CED faculty were from minority groups and 73 percent were female. In the other college, which delivers NCATE-affiliated programs, the College of Health and Human Services, 28 percent of the faculty were from an underrepresented group and 61 percent were female. These percentages for CED and CHHS exceed the campus-wide percentages of 28 percent minority and 41 percent female. The diversity of one other key pool of faculty, non tenure-track university field experience supervisors, was 73 percent female and 21% from under-represented groups. The experiences teaching candidates have in local P-12 schools provide another opportunity for working with diverse faculty. In 2006, the percentages of non-white P-12 teachers for Los Angeles County (45%) and Orange County (19%) Faculty have access to multiple and varied professional development opportunities. Events hosted by the Center for Language Minority Education and Research (CLMER), brown bag lunches, and special events, are often diversity-focused. Faculty self-report feeling confident in their own preparation for teaching for diversity. A "Faculty Diversity Survey" completed in the fall 2006 provided illuminating data. Consistently, more than 75 percent of responding faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the CSULB: had made good faith efforts to recruit diverse faculty (86.8%); feeling knowledgeable about teaching concepts related to diversity (95.1%); and feeling comfortable teaching concepts related to diversity (93.7%). The survey confirmed, as was reported in the Institutional Report, that CSULB has been relatively less successful retaining diverse faculty; 65.2 percent agreed or strongly agreed that there have been good faith efforts to retain diverse faculty. Recruitment and hiring policies in place at CSULB clearly suggest that the Institution desires to attract a pool of qualified applicants that are both qualified and diverse. A Director or Equity and Diversity must approve all recruitment and advertising plans. Over the past two reporting years (2004-2005 and 2005-2006), the CED 9 of 13 tenure-track hires were female and 4 were from traditionally underrepresented groups.

C. Experiences working with diverse candidates

In 2005-2006, university-wide, the student population was 36 percent White, 24 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, 24 percent Hispanic, and 5 percent Black (6% of candidates did not report). Similarly, there was no single majority ethnic/racial group in initial teacher preparation programs. The largest group of teaching candidates were White, non-Hispanic students (39%-54% within various programs). Other significant groups were Hispanic (19%-35%), Asian/Pacific Islander (8-21%), and Black (2%-8%). Institution-wide, 61n percent of students were female. Within the four reported initial teacher preparation programs, the percentage of female students exceeded the university average; the percentage of female students ranged from 62 percent in the Single Subject Program to 91 percent in the Multiple Subject Program.

For advanced programs, 2005-2006, the percentage of candidates from different ethnic, racial, gender, and socio-economic group was also striking. Overall, 39.7 percent of advanced program candidates were White, non-Hispanic. The other largest groups included Hispanic (25.6%),

Asian/Pacific Islander (14.5%) and Black, non-Hispanic (7.4%). Gender-wise, 84.9 percent of the students enrolled in advanced programs were female.

The unit identified several initiatives and programs that have been the most successful at attracting candidates from diverse backgrounds. These programs include alternative pathway programs (such as the internship credential pathway), bilingual credential programs/pathways (Spanish Bilingual Crosscultural and Academic Development—BCLAD and the new Master of Arts Dual Language Development Program), and math/science-related initiatives that are supported by external grant funds.

Generally over the past many years, the student population at CSULB has grown very rapidly (100% increase in enrollment in the CED over the past decade) and also grown increasingly diverse. This pattern of change reflects concomitant change in the demographics of the surrounding geographic area.

Clearly, the teaching candidates, because they are such a diverse group, provide each other with many of their most powerful opportunities for learning about diversity. Teaching candidates and faculty consistently celebrated and recognized the diversity of the students as a major strength for the Unit. One often-cited factor that enhances the power of diversity amongst students is a strong, pervasive unit-wide commitment to collaboration. Course syllabi and student comments revealed a high level of frequency in terms of the number of course activities and assignments that were group-based.

D. Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools

California's current P-12 student population (6.3 million total students) is unusually diverse. 2005-2006 data reported that 30.3 percent of P-12 students are White, non-Hispanic. The remaining 69.7 percent are Hispanic/Latino (47.6%), Asian (10.8%), African American (7.8%) and other (3.4%). State-wide, 25.2% of P-12 students are English Language Learners and 50.8 percent of these students qualify for free or reduced lunches.

Of the 53 Cooperating School Districts that are reported as being affiliated with CSULB, only 20 exceed the statewide percentage of 30.3 percent White, non Hispanic students. Even more revealing is the fact that an overwhelming percentage of CSULB's initial certification (multiple-subject, single subject, and education specialist) student teachers are placed in P-12 schools where the percentage of White, non-Hispanic students is less than 20 percent. The largest number of student teachers (N=327) were placed in the Long Beach School District; a district whose White, non-Hispanic population is 16.9 percent.

Placement patterns for early field experiences mirror the diversity of student teaching placements. The first series of field experiences for Multiple Subject candidates, the SERVE Program, is completed while pursuing an undergraduate Liberal Studies major. SERVE requires 120 clock hours of work in schools that are diverse and urban settings. One significant statistic that relates directly to the SERVE Program is the fact that 490 of the 2005-2006 participants spoke Spanish as a second language. In addition, Serve participants spoke 10 other second languages (more than 15 spoke Cambodian, French, Khmer, Tagalog, and Vietnamese).

The effectiveness of diverse field experiences is supported by course/practicum assignments that are explicitly focused on diversity-related issues.

At the advanced level, it was clear that programs explicitly and consistently required that all or part of required practicums/internships be completed in school settings that the program/unit considers to be diverse.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Recommendation: STANDARD MET

Standard Four is strength for CSULB Unit. The curriculum for both initial and advanced programs demonstrated a strong commitment to diversity. Candidate performance and program assessment data was consistently positive. The faculty and student body are diverse and growing more diverse each year. Diverse field experiences are the norm at both the initial and advanced levels.

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 5: Faculty Performance and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Levels: Initial and Advanced

A. Qualified faculty

California State University, Long Beach (CSLUB) faculty at the initial and advanced levels hold a terminal degree for tenure track and professional certification for non-tenure track based on information from the IR. Relevant experience in P-12 schools is required for professional education faculty. This represents experience as classroom teachers, administrators, counselors, curriculum specialist and staff developers. Tenure track faculty average over 5 years of P-12 experience the figure is much higher for adjunct faculty. There were 224 full time and part time faculty in 2005-2006.

During 2005-2006 there were 132 part-time faculty who were hired based on their academics and experiential qualifications to teach selected courses and supervise clinical and field experiences. In addition, there were 136 supervisors who supervised field and clinical experiences in their area of certification. Eighty two percent of the part time faculty supervising students had masters degrees and seventeen percent held a doctorate. Many of these are employed as P-12 educators, or recently retired and have advanced degree in areas such as reading, early childhood education, curriculum and instruction, leadership, in the liberal arts, and science disciplines. They provide expertise in their specialty areas and the wealth of their vast experience to candidates that they teach, mentor and supervise. Part time faculty teach classes and supervise field experiences in the initial, advanced and other school personnel programs. They have had numerous professional in services that keep them current in their field.

P-12 teachers must meet the following criteria to be hired: be tenured in their district, have at least 3 years of teaching experience and be credentialed in their teaching, service, or administrative field. Cooperating teachers who work with candidates in their early field experience frequently serve as master teachers for student teachers. In many cases P-12 teachers who work with candidates in field work are graduates of unit programs. Part time faculty supervisors receive training in the use of assessments and 20 supervisors have completed the 3 day training to become certified assessors for California Teaching Performance Assessments. As indicated by interviews of current and graduated candidates faculty possess both school experience and terminal degrees and are able to provide a comprehensive learning experience.

Faculty at both levels have an aggregated total of over 300 years experience as classroom teacher, counselors, principals and other school professionals. They maintain contemporary professional experiences in school settings by conducting action research and projects in schools that they partner with. They serve as consultants to districts and schools, they supervise student teachers and interns and also teach courses and monitor candidate work in partner school districts

(Table 5.04 IR Pg 4). They collaborate with partner schools faculty for professional development opportunities and creating cohorts of learning environments.

B. Modeling best professional practices in teaching

Faculty use of a variety of instructional methods, planning of field /learning experiences, grant activities, use of technology, assessments, evaluations, scholarship and service reflect the unit's conceptual framework and goals. Faculty use a variety of tools like group discussions, writing activities, gaining field experiences, observations, community participation and service to incorporate current research and development in the field.

Course Syllabi provide evidence of class presentations, use of portfolios, examinations, case studies, reflective practices, cooperative learning, use and application of technology to encourage reflection, critical thinking and problem solving. These tools demonstrate that best practices and current research are embedded in instructional practices and facilitate higher level thinking skills. Faculty model/teach professional dispositions to candidates, by providing oral or written directions to candidates on professional behavior, dress, roles and responsibilities. Evidence of this is in the two hour training that candidates receive before SERVE placements.

Instructional strategies used by the faculty are discussions, lectures, modeling, didactic instruction, presentations, demonstrations, using questions to engage students, facilitating learning, using collaborative practices that are researched based and aligned to current best practices.

Assessments are varied and multiple. They range from paper and pencil quizzes, to writing short answers, case studies, research papers, and reflection papers. Candidates confirmed in their interviews that they conduct research, classroom presentations, collaborative projects, exams, take home comprehensive exams, work on thesis and assignments. All these paths are used to assess students' knowledge, skills and dispositions.

The make up of the faculty themselves reflect diversity and many specialize in English learners (Tables 5.01, 5.02 IR Pgs1,2). The *Guideline for Curriculum Review* required faculty to submit proposals for all new programs and courses to address the issue of diversity. As they develop programs and review coursework they work on a developmental sequence of treatment of diversity issues. Table 4.15 IR Pg15 collates examples of faculty scholarship around diversity issues. The selection of textbooks and materials are considered reflections of diversity. Other evidence of knowledge and experiences in diversity are found in the survey evidence from programs. Candidate perceptions and employment supervisors rating indicate positive preparations. Faculty and candidate interviews revealed that knowledge and experiences in diversity were thoughtfully planned in the field experiences. "Here and Now" discussions on diversity in classrooms were another example of instructional opportunities present because of the diverse make up of candidates and faculty. Interviews from current and past students clearly support faculty knowledge and experience in diversity.

A Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers in Technology (PT3) federal grant which operated in 2000-2003 supported the faculty to make great changes in the use of technology. Increasing number of

faculty use common technological practices that include Beach Board (Black Board), power points, multi media presentations, videotaping, technology facilitated data analysis, digital photos and streaming video development. Faculty are supported by technology specialists who work one on one through the Faculty Center for Professional Development. The 2006 administration of the Technology Survey revealed a wide range of technology utilization. Evidence of incorporation of technology into instruction was supported by course descriptions, student interviews, technology labs, and staff support of technology implementation.

Interviews from current and advanced degree candidates about faculty at CSULB elicited comments like “They had high expectations”, “We were well prepared”, “Modeled instructional strategies we could use”, “Changed our thinking about diversity”, and “Very accessible”. Current and past candidates shared that the faculty modeled best practices, reflective thinking and prepared them well to meet the demands of their classroom experiences. They were able to articulate the components under knowledge, skills and dispositions as stated in the conceptual framework.

Faculty compile portfolios towards their evaluations where they self assess and reflect on their practices under the components of teaching, scholarly pursuits and service. The retention, tenure, promotion (RTP) process provides faculty to analyze qualitative and quantitative data from course evaluations and engage in systematic self assessment. They analyze student evaluations of their teaching practices once a semester and use it to inform their practices. Weekly meetings, strategic planning and evaluating programs are opportunities for faculty to continuously self review and reflect. Evidence of collaborations include working on research paper, publishing books, articles, writing projects, review, revision, plan of courses, candidate advising and placement. These activities cause faculty to systematically engage in self-assessment and update their teaching.

C. Modeling best professional practices in scholarship

Scholarly work expectations outlined in the Faculty Handbook under Evaluations include traditional research, publications, presentations at a number of major professional organizations and related fields. A summary of these activities is documented in the table (Table 5.05 IR Pg 5). Faculty vitae also show extent of active and ongoing scholarly work. Evidence of publications are displayed in the lobby of the College of Education main building.

Some research projects that faculty are involved in are directly related to teaching and learning. One example is a year long study conducted with math teachers in six Long Beach Schools to find measurable criteria of teaching ability and to evaluate how CSULB graduates factors in their teaching. Student data is used to determine metacognitive skills associated with math literacy.

Other studies clearly evidence action research, collaborative partnerships, investigations that explore issues of teaching and learning. Faculty are involved in presentations (international, national, regional and state) in publishing professional journals, books and creative works. Faculty are also actively engaged in securing external and internal grants to support their own scholarly pursuits (Tables 5.06, 5.07 IR Pgs 6 and 7).

In 2005-2006 19 the unit faculty received assigned time and summer stipends to support their scholarship. Twenty unit grants and projects were funded in 2005-2006. In interviews with the dean and faculty members it was determined that over 80% of the fulltime faculty were engaged in scholarship at this time.

D. Modeling best professional practices in service

Faculty are expected to be engaged in campus governance by serving on department, college, and campus committees. At the university level they serve on committees like WASC, Assessment, Financial Affairs, Teacher Preparations, and Academic Senate. At the unit level faculty serve on committees like Faculty Council, Curriculum, Student Appeals, Technology, and the RTO review. At the department level they serve on department /program specific committees such as RTP, Curriculum and Faculty Search. At the candidate level they hold orientations, advising sessions, maintaining web-based information sites, supervising independent studies and thesis and monitoring and evaluating comprehensive examinations. Additionally they are expected to serve on their own professional communities as board members, committee chairs, conference organizers, editors and presenters. They are expected to serve at local communities and partnerships that draws on their professional expertise and knowledge.

In the professional community faculty are members of international, national and state organizations, serve as board members, committee chairs, and conference organizers. They serve as editors of major journals as members of refereed journal editorial boards. In the local community they serve as liaisons to partner schools, collaborate on research or professional development activities with professionals and parents, develop and evaluate programs, serve on advisory, improvement, and other committees in schools. Faculty volunteer in school classrooms, provide assessment and diagnostic services and teach lessons in local schools.

In 2005-2006, 137 faculty members were involved in scholarly service activity (newsletter, proposal reviewer, journal reviewer, journal editor), 48 were actively involved in service to local education agency (LEA), 24 to state education agency (SEA) and 41 held positions in professional organizations. A high percentage of faculty were involved in these various types of service activities (Table 5.08 IR Pg8).

E. Collaboration

Faculty collaborates regularly and often with colleagues in P-12 schools, arts and sciences, other units at the institution and the broader professional community. Some examples are:

- Partnership with the city of Long Beach and two other education institutions Long Beach Unified School District and Long Beach City college (Long Beach Education Partnership, LBEP).
- The SERVE program which helps place students in field and clinical experiences.
- The Distinguished Faculty in Residence program which provides lecturer appointments.
- The Reading Institute for Academic Preparations (RIAP) which runs workshops to train teachers in developing curricula for meeting the needs of at risk students.

- The California P-16 Conference for Students Success hosted annually on campus to collaborate for student success.
- The Collaborative Research: Electronic Books project implementing e-books in partner schools. They have presented research results at the American Educational Research Association and the National Reading Conference.
- The Asian Bilingual Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (Asian BLACD) consortium which directly address the critical need for Asian language speaking credentialed teacher. In the fall of 2005, the program had 158 students enrolled 101 of who were based at CSULB.

Faculty collaborate across schools and programs to integrate course descriptions, field placements, use of technology, sharing assessment information from class surveys, discuss program effectiveness, integrate technology, create awareness of diversity and prepare students to meet the needs of their profession. The different committees, advising offices and organizations provide evidence of collaboration with partners in the community to impact teaching and learning. Professional partnerships have resulted in better preparations for candidates therefore resulting in increased student learning (Table 5.10 IR Pg 11).

All the above collaborations have resulted in impacting teaching, learning and student achievement as evidenced by interviews with community, faculty and candidates. A concrete example is the collaboration with The Bret Harte Elementary school where the achievement data is evidence of improved teaching, candidate learning and teacher education. Fifty teachers have undergone professional development and received onsite support that impacted student achievement at this school.

F. Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance

Faculty evaluations are conducted through two formal paths: First, student evaluations of faculty administered through course evaluations (all faculty are formally evaluated by their students each semester on a minimum of two courses). These evaluations are collected, machine-scored and tabulated by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. The survey which has eight questions addresses effective planning and instruction. The forms are returned to faculty members and the summary reports are turned in to the department chairs, the dean and faculty members. Mean scores in eight survey categories are provided to the faculty with comparative scores for the department and college. Second, is the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process. The College of Education has created a single college RTP governing document and it was revised by the Faculty Council in 2005. In this process high stakes review for retention/promotion alternates with a mini-evaluation. The high stakes retention review is conducted in the third year of employment with tenure and promotion to associate professor determined in the sixth year of employment. At this point normally after gaining tenure faculty are eligible for promotion to full professor. Tenured faculty are reviewed every five years. A department committee reviews their materials/portfolios and then the dean meets with the faculty member for an individual review. Third, part time faculty, (lecturers, part time instructors, supervisors of student teachers) are reviewed on an annual basis by department committees and department chairs. They submit a portfolio for evaluation

Comparison of Aggregated Course Evaluations 2003-2006 (Table 5.11 IR Pg 12) shows that the faculty of the College of Education grow from fall to spring on survey item 8 which is “Rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor in this course.” They score high on course evaluations. RIP process directs review committees to be specific in their evaluations (feedback from previous reviews are included in each periodic review) and provided constructive advice.

Evaluations are used to improve teaching, scholarship and service as department chairs and deans meet with faculty concerning RTP recommendations and provide constructive advice for improvement where appropriate. They are referred to other faculty members who have related expertise and take on the job of mentors. Expert faculty conduct class visits or observations with feedback for the individual on teaching skills. The Faculty Center for Professional Development is a source for providing professional development and improving instructional practices. The Dean or Department head will consult, support, and suggest workshops to complete scholarship goals. If the area of improvement is service then suggestions are made to enter committees or make contributions to the community and professional organizations. New faculty are supported with a week-long orientation and a year- long structured professional plan to be able to accomplish their goals.

G. Unit facilitation of professional development

As outlined by the mission statement of the unit, professional development for all faculty, at both the advanced and the initial are continuous and ongoing. The Strategic Planning Committee provides leadership with regard to providing opportunities to address the professional development needs of all faculty.

Unit meetings of the Strategic Planning Committee which are held the first Monday of every month address needs and areas of professional development. Some examples of professional development conducted are: The Center for Language Minority Education and Research (CLMER) which is housed in the College of Education hosts professional development opportunities like a symposium titled *From Achievement gap to Opportunity Gap: Reframing the discussion and Identifying Successes*.

Another opportunity titled *The 30-Year Commemoration of Public Law 94-142* held in November 2005 saw a panel of experts, noted researchers, parents, deans, faculty, teachers, students with disabilities come together to critically examine legislation on disabilities.

Brown Bag Sessions (Table 5.12) lists activities/topics that are organized around faculty research, scholarly work, and travel throughout the world. In 2005-2006 there were 11 such presentations made and these presentations provide practice and exposure to faculty for formal presentations at professional organizations.

New faculty are supported in a variety of ways including being mentored by a senior faculty member who coaches on effective instruction, observes them teaching, educates on diversity and links them to more experienced faculty to meet their needs (Table 5.13 IR Pg.14). The Associate Dean for Research, Planning and Evaluations consults, proofs drafts of writing projects and other

scholarly expectations. Senior faculty with necessary experience advice on preparing and submitting manuscripts for publication.

New faculty have opportunities before the start of the academic year to receive orientation, develop manuscripts, write grant proposals, discuss research ideas, monitor and check progress, receive general support for teaching, scholarship and service (Table 5.13 IR Pg13) Involvement in faculty development activities varies across departments and programs. Table 5.14 IR Pg 15 states that faculty had 97 campus -based professional development activities in 2005 -2006. Off campus professional development activities were 104.

Examples of professional development opportunities were The Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology (PT3) grant from 2000-2003. This grant supported six EDPAC educational technology coaches to work one on one with 62 (72%) unit faculty members to customize technology training. Faculty present on the use of technological programs like Power Point, Beach Board, and Excel. Another example is the Faculty Center for Professional Development which is a source of workshops for a variety of teaching and scholarly activities. In 2005-2006 the Center sponsored 8 to 10 faculty members to engage in a year-long program whose aim was to enhance teaching and learning by using technology. Faculty collaborate and meet regularly to examine course content, reading materials, assignments, assessments, and instruction. The Professional Studies Department holds a professional development each semester. Tenure track faculty attend and present at a wide variety of national, international and regional conferences both individually and collaboratively.

Part time faculty participate in professional development in their primary place of employment, and are often able to attend on-campus professional development activities.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Unit faculty meet the Standard 5 criteria for qualified staff who model professional practices in teaching, scholarship, service, and collaboration. Evidence indicates candidates demonstrate ability to think critically, reflect, problem solve, and display appropriate dispositions. The faculty are engaged in professional partnerships with local and surrounding school districts, they are engaged in service to the institution and community, and scholarly involvement with other professional institutions. They are continuously enrolled in professional development and evaluations of their professional performance.

Recommendation: (met)

Areas for Improvement: None

Removed: At the initial level, the single subject programs are inconsistent in the regularity with which university supervisors are evaluated

State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Initial and Advance Level

A. Unit leadership and authority

The College of Education and the affiliated programs in the College of Health and Human Services is the designated unit and provides the leadership for all educator preparation programs at the university, including coordination of accreditation and state program approval activities and oversight of curriculum and policies. The unit head administers all initial and advanced programs and is responsible for strategic planning to ensure the unit standards are met within the context of the college's goals. As head of the unit, the dean reports to the Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs.

The College of Education has three departments: Teacher Education; Educational Psychology, Administration, and Counseling; and Liberal Studies. The fourth major unit in the college is the Single Subject Credential Program, a university-wide secondary education program that is housed in the college. The affiliated programs are embedded in the College of Health and Human Services. These include three programs for other school personnel, a program in vocational education, and a program leading to authorization to teach Adapted Physical Education. Table 6.01 (IR, p.5) illustrates the relationship among the two colleges, individual departments, and various programs in the unit. Credential programs are linked to the unit for accreditation purposes; however, they are administratively within their respective departments.

The primary governing body of the unit is the Teacher Preparation Committee, comprised of the Provost, unit dean, the initial teacher preparation program coordinators, faculty representing each of the university colleges, and representatives from the library and student services. This committee is the mechanism by which input from the colleges and campus entities is infused systematically into the unit's decision-making. The faculty council is the primary faculty governance committee in the unit; the committee is advisory to the dean. Two important subcommittees of the faculty council charged with key roles are the strategic planning committee, which oversees all the planning and assessment efforts, and the graduate programs committee, which oversees policies and procedures for all advanced graduate programs.

Through the advisory committee, the unit involves the P-16 professional community regularly and meaningfully in the design, implementation, and evaluation of unit programs. The advisory committee is comprised of district superintendents, administrators of community colleges, community representatives, teachers, and principals. As outlined in the IR and confirmed by program coordinators, individual programs also have community advisory boards. Interviews with unit head, associate deans, unit department chairs, faculty, teachers, and administrators indicated that the unit faculty actively solicit feedback from its P-12 partners regarding programming. Several pieces of information reviewed, including department faculty and

advisory committee meeting minutes, confirm two-way communication expressly for the purpose of soliciting suggestions from P-12 partner schools and teachers. For example, collaboration with P-12 school partners and community colleges has informed unit faculty in the development of the curriculum in regards to the newly formed Ed.D. in Educational Leadership and course structure in the liberal studies program. In addition, the unit maintains a Center of Collaboration in Education which serves as a coordinating agency for university collaboration and service to schools and community. Table 5.09 (IR, p.9) provides several examples and types of collaborative partnerships among the unit, public schools and the community.

The university, college, and program websites and university catalog maintain an extensive and easy-to-navigate resource that provides clear information about student services available to all candidates in the initial and advanced professional education programs and other programs throughout the university. The information in the university catalog is updated annually, and checklists and handbooks are updated on a regular basis. Interviews with university deans and faculty in other colleges confirms that the unit regularly communicates with personnel in other departments regarding requirements (e.g., classes required for a candidate in various concentrations) and the accuracy of the unit descriptions of certification requirements. Students' rights are explicitly outlined in the college catalog, including grade appeals, student grievances, sexual harassment, ethics, and social rights.

As confirmed by the unit head and faculty, full-time faculty members in the unit serve as advisors for certification purposes. Faculty and staff see candidates on a walk-in basis and by appointments, and conduct telephone and e-mail advisement. The advisor holds additional orientation sessions designed to acquaint potential candidates with the conceptual framework, various state and national standards, and other aspects related to certification. The advisor also has several individual meetings with each student during the year in order to assist the student with program planning and the declaration of a major. Program coordinators also hold monthly information and recruiting workshops throughout the year in which general information is disseminated. According to program coordinators, each program holds a variety of orientation meetings at which faculty can advise candidates. Program coordinators are provided with units of assigned time in part to ensure availability for student advisement about program requirements. The Teacher Preparation and Advising Center in the college also serves as a prime source for advising candidates in both initial and advanced programs. Also, the Educational Career Services office organizes job fairs, coaches students regarding interviews, and provides resume development assistance.

Recruitment is coordinated by the associate dean who works closely with department chairs, faculty, and staff around specific outreach efforts. Program coordinators in the affiliated programs actively recruit candidates from the College of Health and Human Services degree programs by making presentations to classes. As displayed in the documents room, recruitment and admission practices are clearly described in a variety of publications. College, department, and program websites are also effective ways in which qualified applicants are attracted to the programs.

The unit is also actively involved in other recruiting initiatives, including the Math and Science Teacher Initiative and the Urban Teachers Academy. The math and science initiative is part of

the California State University system effort to increase the number of math and science teachers in the state. Coordinated by faculty in the unit, the Urban Teacher Academy project works in three partner elementary school sites. Its purpose is to have on-site preparation and field experiences for teachers at all levels of preservice and inservice development, ensuring a continuous pattern of learning.

All students have access to counseling and psychological services. An individual can self-refer or be referred by any member of the faculty. Trained counselors are available to assist with personal concerns, future planning, and study skills. The counseling and support services also serves as a referral resource for off-campus psychiatric and mental health services. Any student with a documented disability can contact Disabled Student Services to arrange for necessary services. In addition, the Career Development Center exists to guide students and alumni through a life planning process which includes the development of career-building skills, opportunity awareness, personal gifts and interests, assessment, and exposure to out-of-classroom learning experiences. The Career Service Center, in addition to offering career counseling, also maintains a database of job openings and receives career services bulletins from a number of other colleges/universities. For a detailed listing of student support services available to students, please see Table 6.04 (IR, p.8).

B. Unit Budget

The total university budget is dependent on state funding. The College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services are the vehicles through which the unit receives its funds. Equitable distribution of funding support is ensured through established formulas in areas such as instructional staffing, travel, and student assistant support. According to data supplied by the university financial officer, the education budget compares favorably to similar units on campus. For example, instructional funding for the College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services is distributed at a richer formula than for most of the other colleges, at student faculty ratios of 17.5 to 1 and 17 to 1 respectively. The student faculty ratio for the campus as a whole is 18.9 to 1.

As outlined in Table 6.05 (IR, p.9), the total college budget decreased slightly in 04-05 as enrollment dropped, but rebounded in 05-06. Table 6.06 (IR, p.10) provides the expenditures by departments/unit for the last three years and Table 6.07 (IR, p.11) displays College of Health and Human Services allocations to the affiliated programs for the three most recent years. The Provost for Academic Affairs of CSULB reports there is a strong financial commitment to the university's teacher preparation program.

Interviews across campus support USULB's assertion that the university expects its faculty to be engaged in professional development activities. According to the dean and unit faculty, the university has a system of financial support for sabbaticals, scholarly and creative activities, program innovation, travel, and research through various campus funds awarded on a competitive basis. Table 6.08 (IR, p. 12) outlines the faculty internal funding awards from the past four years. Also, a wide range of professional development opportunities are available at USULB, including: skill development provided by the Faculty Center for Professional Development and other workshops, incorporation of technology into instruction, writing grant proposals, development of research ideas and becoming Lead Assessors for the Commission-

sponsored Teaching Performances Assessment. Further documentation for professional development support for new faculty is outlined in Table 5.03 (IR, p14). In addition, the unit provides support for teaching and program related faculty development activities each year, depending on need and opportunity. For example, new faculty receive a minimum of \$1000 per year for professional travel.

C. Personnel

Consistent with California State University system policy and the collective bargaining agreement, the prescribed workload for faculty at CSULB is 15 teaching units per semester. There is no differentiated teaching load for undergraduate and graduate instruction. Twelve of the 15 are assigned for teaching courses and 3 are dedicated to faculty governance, advising, academic program reviews, and other professional related duties. According to the associate dean and as evidenced in exhibits in the document's room, workloads beyond the maximum teaching load of twelve units per semester are limited by university policy to 25 percent (equivalent to one course per semester) and only by mutual agreement.

An examination of the assigned time load reports reveals that the average teaching load for College of Education full-time faculty for the fall, 2006 is less than 9 hours. Few faculty teach more than 9 units per semester; even fewer faculty teaching all graduate level courses are teaching more than 9 units per semester. Other factors contributing to this average are: newly hired faculty receiving three units of assigned time each semester, assigned time for program coordinators of credential/masters programs, and a high level of funding assigned time for various types of activities.

As evidenced by the faculty qualifications and accomplishments highlighted in Standard 5 (see Table 5.05 (IR, p.5), it is clear that the workload policies allow faculty members to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, service, advisement, and assessment activities. The unit head stated that overload assignments are used sparingly. While faculty may on occasion teach an overload, the unit head has discouraged this among faculty in the unit.

The unit maintains program integrity by the appropriate use of part-time faculty. The use of part-time faculty is generally limited to clinical supervision and teaching a limited number of methods related courses. Many of the part-time faculty are full-time P-12 practitioners. According to unit faculty, all of these individuals are highly-qualified and clearly understand the program requirements. Part-time faculty are required to have the appropriate credentials for the courses they teach, and they are provided with professional development to allow them to serve effectively in their role.

The unit communicates regularly with them via e-mail and meetings. In addition, various programs in the unit have developed Part-Time Faculty Handbooks as a tool to communicate policies, procedures, practice, and program issues. All part-time faculty members use the approved syllabi for the courses they teach, including relevant connections to the conceptual framework and to state and institutional standards.

Interviews with part-time faculty revealed their familiarity with the ability to articulate the unit's conceptual framework; they also indicated extensive interaction with full-time faculty, including

discussions of the use of unit standards and assessment. Part-time faculty are involved in the development of course syllabi. The unit reviews candidate evaluations for each part-time faculty as described in Standard 5. They also receive technology training from the unit.

Interviews with the dean and faculty members indicate that the unit is served by a large and capable support staff. Since the 2001 accreditation visit, changes in the unit have impacted the size and structure of staff support. For example, enrollment growth and technological advances have affected the unit's need to employ additional support personnel. Even though the college experienced significant growth from the 1990s to 2004, there has been a moderate overall decline for the college enrollment since 2004. Table 6.10 (IR, p. 14) shows the relationship between enrollment growth in the college from 2003-2006 and employment trends for administrators, full-time and part-time faculty, and staff. Even though there has been a moderate decline in the college enrollment since 2004, there has been a moderate increase in support staff since during this time period. Also, Table 6.11 (IR, p. 15) indicates the number of staff and administrators and their dispersal across offices in the college in 2005-2006. Together with the several student assistants that are employed each year, the support necessary to address the data management needs, placement assistance, record keeping, and all other administrative/secretarial duties is amply provided.

D. Unit facilities

California State University Long Beach is located in Long Beach, just south of the city of Los Angeles. The campus sits on 322 slightly elevated acres, about three miles from the Pacific Ocean. Eighty permanent buildings house seven (7) colleges, 63 academic departments and programs, 24 centers, four (4) institutes, and four (4) clinics. Various candidate preparation programs are housed primarily in four buildings: education building 1, education building 2, the academic services building and the second floor of the liberal arts 1 building. Additional classrooms used for candidate preparation are typically located in liberal arts 2, liberal arts 3, liberal arts 4, and liberal arts 5 buildings. However, courses are subject to be housed anywhere on campus. Some of the methods classes are scheduled at public schools sites to enhance instruction.

Interviews with the dean and faculty members indicate that classroom space generally meets current college needs. Through creative scheduling, the facilities coordinator has effectively addressed many of the unit's space problems. According to the unit dean, significant space for classrooms and offices will be made available to the college when the library renovation is completed in the summer of 2007. In addition, the affiliated programs offered in the College of Health and Human Services are located in five different buildings, all of which are supported by adequate classroom space, laboratories, and clinics.

All university classrooms have Ethernet ports for Internet connection and wireless internet access. Of approximately 230 classrooms on campus, 115 are "smart." All of the classrooms allocated to the College in Education Building 1 and 2 are newly furnished. For example, all the 26 classrooms allocated to the college are equipped with a Smart Panel and Data/Video projector. Technology use by candidates is both expected and supported. All handbooks and checklists have been placed online, and candidates have ample opportunities to use software and

practice other presentation modes in classes. Candidates are able to apply their technological skills while in the schools.

The facilities are adequate to serve the needs of the candidates and faculty. Private offices with Internet connections and modern computers are provided for each faculty member. The university utilizes a California State University system formula that stipulates a minimum of 110 square feet of office space. Part-time faculty are able to share an office and they have access to computers and the Internet. In addition, the library supports the unit through its elementary school textbook collection, the secondary school textbook collection, and the 20,000 volume children's collection. Thousands of local school children visit this library each year.

E. Unit resources including technology

The unit receives adequate funding for programs to support student learning (please see Table 6.05 (IR, p. 9). The unit allocates resources across programs to prepare candidates to meet standards for their fields and to support the development and implementation of the assessment plan. Programs in education are supported through an annual operating budget. Faculty do, however, successfully obtain externally funded grants that serve to augment the curricular offerings and supports faculty research in the unit (see Table 6.12 IR, p.15 for a listing of external grant funding for past three years). Instructional resources are funded through the college's operating budget.

Secretarial support for the assessment system is more than adequate. While there has been significant grant funding in which the unit has participated in recent years, the unit does not draw upon grants, donations, and special projects to operate core academic programs. However, each college in the university is assigned a full-time development officer. Under the leadership of the unit's development officer, the college has exceeded its annual development target two of the last three years. This added support for the college is used for student scholarships, faculty development activities, and special recognition. Please see Table 6.13 (IR, p. 17) for a record of grants and gifts awarded in recent years.

Assessment activities in the unit have become a routine function as data are used to guide the programs. Faculty members provide summaries every semester of their key assessments and reflect regularly on their teaching. These summaries are maintained in course folios and are used to prepare annual assessment summaries. The Unit Assessment System (UAS) was developed by the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) under the leadership of the Associate Dean for Planning, Research and Evaluation, who has primary responsibility for assessment and evaluation.

BeachBoard (a web-based integrated courseware program customized from BlackBoard's software program) is the campus medium for instruction, and includes several features that facilitate meaningful technology incorporation: online resources, e-mail and discussion forums, online quizzes and surveys that provide instant feedback, group pages to facilitate collaboration outside of class time, hypertext links, electronic grade book, course statistics, and TurnItIn to preclude plagiarism.

The college provides significant technological support for students. Smart Classrooms, throughout the campus, are used by faculty to foster integration of technology into classroom activity. In addition, TaskStream is utilized by the Multiple Subject Program as the administrative vehicle for various assignments. For example, all candidates in the subject-specific pedagogy courses, during fieldwork, and in student teaching create e-folios of their learning on TaskStream. A number of school districts in the university service area employ TaskStream for their teacher induction programs, which permits graduates to use their TaskStream e-folio and other materials after they leave the program.

All of the 26 classrooms allocated to the college are adequately furnished. Sixteen include whiteboards and electronic capabilities. In addition to the standard audio-visual equipment located in each room, they are equipped with a Smart Panel and Data/Video Projector. The college and individual departments own several LCD portable projectors, laptop computers, camcorders, and digital cameras that faculty check out for class use. There are 25 electronic classrooms located on campus, nineteen of which are strictly for academic classrooms with the remainder used for conference rooms

Unit faculty and candidates have access to sufficient and current library and curricular resources and electronic information. The university library houses an extensive collection of print, non-print, and electronic resources that support teaching and learning. The library's holdings comprise over one million items and 160 databases. The library subscribes to approximately 1,000 journals in paper format and several thousand more are supplied in full-text online. In addition to books and periodicals, the library has many online resources that are available to students and faculty and are not restricted to campus use. The library has also expanded its electronic access to materials in an inter-library loan agreement. Any student at CSULB can secure a library card and have access to these materials. New resources are added to the library on a regular basis. Unit faculty and the Library Advisory Committee provide the library with suggested purchases of books and other resources to support the teacher preparation program. The Library's homepage provides information on offsite access to the Library resources. In addition, the library houses a selection of materials used in P-12 schools (i.e., teacher edition, textbooks etc). This valuable resource is used by candidates as well as by local teachers.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The unit provides the leadership for all educator preparation programs at the university, including coordination of accreditation and state program approval activities and oversight of curriculum and policies. As head of the unit, the dean reports to the Provost of Academic Affairs. The unit head administers all unit programs and is responsible for strategic planning to ensure the unit standards are met within the context of the university's mission. The unit has adequate policies and procedures to govern and maintain an effective unit. The unit budget, personnel, technology, and facilities are adequate and support full functioning of the varied programs offered throughout the unit.

Recommendation: Met

Areas for Improvement: None

Removed: The institution has not systematically monitored the progress of candidates in the initial programs through appropriate academic and professional advising.

State Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Internship Issues for State Report:

Common Standards 1 and 2- Leadership and Resources

The Colleges of Education has official agreements with each school district in which an intern is employed. Each district provides each intern with a support provider and when needed, additional resources.

Common Standard 4- Evaluation

Within the College of Education in 2006(Spring and Fall) there were 57 Single Subject interns, 9 Multiple Subject Interns and 41 Education Specialist Interns. The Single and Multiple Subject Program Coordinators coordinate their intern programs for the unit as does the Education Specialist Program Coordinator. All of the coordinators report to an Associate Dean of the College of Education. The advisory councils for each of the programs address intern issues as needed. They also review program design, candidate and school district needs, program implementation and assessment and program improvement.

Common Standard 5-Admission

Admission of intern candidates is coordinated by the program coordinators for each of the programs. Each internship program evaluates internship candidates to make certain that they meet admission criteria, and the evaluation includes an inventory of prior experiences that prepare them for the responsibilities of an internship position.

Common Standard 6-Advice and Assistance

Upon acceptance, intern candidates must sign a contract which details requirements and deadlines as well as a specific listing of the courses and sections in which the intern must enroll. During the supervised fieldwork portion of the program regularly scheduled seminars are held with the interns for support and professional development, and there are opportunities for interns to seek guidance with particular situations. Handbooks for the credential programs are provided for each candidate. The handbooks outline the program and the professional expectations and responsibilities and chart the course for completion of the credential program.

Common Standard 7- School Collaboration

The selection of the site provider and/or site support team is made with the assistance of the site leadership.

Common Standard 8-Field Supervisors

Field supervisors take on a special role for interns already working in the schools. The university provides supervisors with training opportunities and evaluates their work. Logs of meetings with interns are maintained by supervisors.

PROGRAM STANDARDS

Multiple Subject Credential Multiple Subject Internship Credential Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Korean, Khmer, Mandarin, Spanish or Vietnamese) Credential

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Multiple Subjects Program.

The program is designed quite well and is clearly coherent. Candidates interviewed understood their way to the various credential and program outcomes. The courses lead candidates into a clear understanding of content pedagogy and instructional methods. Syllabi, as well as candidates and graduates interviewed validated that the program design equips candidates with content standards mastery and pedagogical standards mastery. TPE and TPA assessment data verified high competency rates for program completers. Subject matter proficiency assessment all demonstrated high pass rates in the data presented. The program has historically included a Multiple Subject internship. Candidates and employers related to the internship program indicated that it had met local district needs well. Former interns, now teachers, indicated that the program, like the others at CSULB, had prepared them well for service in the classroom. The program is small and will not enroll new candidates unless local market needs increase.

Faculty committee minutes reviewed and faculty members interviewed verified that the program is collaboratively governed among the College of Education and the subject matter departments of English, Math, Science, Physical Education, Visual and Performing Arts, Health and Social Sciences. Collaboration has extended throughout the local school districts with several partnerships growing up from grass-roots connections that have influenced multiple subject/BCLAD credential course content and delivery. Funding is pursued through collaboration with local districts. Significant grants have been awarded to the BCLAD program.

Candidates are involved in extensive fieldwork activity prior to their student teaching phase and have numerous opportunities to be assessed with regard to reflective practice about teaching and learning. TPA data presented a picture of high quality, rigorous teacher preparation validated by practice proven in student teaching. In some cases, candidates participate in a Professional Development School (PDS) program and in PDS-types of off-campus experiences

Master teachers and graduates interviewed verified the perception of a high quality program that equipped them well for teaching with confidence. Courses and field experiences equip candidates with excellent skills and dispositions for dealing with a diverse k-12 student population, especially going beyond Hispanic cultural groups and addressing the large Asian-language student populations of California. Opportunities for learning about diversity are numerous. Frequent and pervasive reflections by candidates throughout the program equip them for understanding best practices and their own teaching effectiveness. Subject-specific content

Pedagogy is introduced through content courses throughout the four tracks for the Multiple Subject Credential Program.

Candidates and graduates interviewed were conversant in multiple instructional methods and their rationale for use. The syllabi analyzed and the faculty members interviewed, verified that course sequences for the program ensure that candidates have opportunity to prepare in all the content subjects related to the Multiple Subject Credential, and to practice delivering it in field experiences prior to engaging in student teaching. Candidate survey data demonstrate high percentages of confidences as a result of the program and field experiences. Assessment summary data verified that candidates, overall, achieve a high rate in pedagogical content knowledge and pedagogical understanding with means ranging between 3.4 to 3.6 on a 4 point scale. Survey data representing employing supervisors of graduates validated high levels of competence by program completers with regard to content pedagogical knowledge and pedagogical proficiency.

The unit is “data-rich”, including the MSCP. Faculty committee minutes verified the uses of assessment data that were discussed and that lead to the program evolution as it is now delivered. Advisory Councils contribute and feel validated and valued.

Strengths:

The Unit has an advising center that engages with the candidates from initial application through program completion. Staff members routinely contact candidates to motivate completion of forms, documents, and procedures necessary to proceed through the various check points. Candidates and graduates interviewed praised the level of support and mentoring they receive from the advising center.

School District personnel report that the teachers from the program are some of the most well-prepared and quickly excel. Diversity programs and opportunities are outstanding.

The document, interviews with faculty and leaders, and the electronic resources demonstrate a data-rich environment permeating the unit. Committee minutes demonstrate how frequently decisions about the program are based on analyses of these data.

Concerns:

None noted.

**Single Subject Credential Program
Single Subject Credential Internship Program**

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, interviews of current students, student teachers, graduates, program faculty, and employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Single Subject Credential Program (SSCP) except for Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork. Standard 15

is met with concerns specifically for the single subject physical education students who are concurrently earning an adapted physical education credential

Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork

The students in the single subject physical education program who are concurrently completing the Adapted Physical Education Specialist credential are not participating in the range of student teaching activities required by single subject physical education program standards.

It is evident that the faculty of the School of Education has created a program that has multiple layers of support and experience necessary for the successful transition from student to classroom teacher. Course syllabi, interviews with the candidates, graduates and instructors confirmed that the program provided a clear understanding of the content pedagogy and instructional methods. The SSCP faculty receives regularly scheduled professional development (through the availability of grant monies) in the best ways to incorporate the TPEs and TPAs into their course curriculum.

Evidence shows that candidates are thoroughly exposed to the teaching profession through the rigorous fieldwork requirement in the EDSS 300 course. Advisement is significant and timely from the Teacher Preparation Advising Center and the subject major credential program advisor. Once entering into the SSCP program, candidates are required to complete co-requisite courses and core courses that incorporate the required TPEs and TPAs. Candidates are well versed in numerous types of self assessment and complete the capstone student teaching in both culturally diverse and non-culturally diverse schools. Candidates also have the opportunity to complete the credential program while enrolled in the internship credential program and are teamed with a mentor on the school campus to provide additional support.

CSULB SSCP faculty infuse the CTC Program Standards (current issues in the education profession, best preparations for teaching a culturally diverse and special education populations, differentiated instruction, classroom management, technology usage and lesson planning using multiple intelligences) throughout the program curriculum.

The student teachers are provided multiple contacts with local school districts to help them fulfill their fieldwork requirements and student teaching assignments. Collaboration between the University and LEAs is clearly evident and provided by the subject matter advisors, the Advisement Center, and the SSCP course instructors.

Strengths:

The use of the EDSS 300 (Introduction to Teaching) class and required 45 hours of fieldwork to inform and recruit potential teaching candidates to the profession has been extremely successful in attracting quality candidates. The high quality of the master teachers at the LEAs is a result of strong collaboration between the LEA and CSULB. Most master teachers have completed coursework at CSULB, and are instructors at CSULB, or are CSULB SSCP graduates. CSULB graduates and candidates in the Single Subject credential program overwhelmingly confirm that their program was a very positive experience and felt confident and well prepared to respond to their student teaching assignments. Candidates, graduates, faculty and LEA personnel reflect enthusiasm and praise for the CSULB credential program.

Concerns:

None noted.

Reading Certificate Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential

Findings on Standards:

Based on a careful review of the institutional report, the program report, supporting documentation and numerous interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and members of the advisory committee, the team concluded that all program standards are met for both the Reading Certificate and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs.

The Reading Certificate and Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential are nested within a Master of Arts in Education degree program designed to provide advanced professional preparation in the field of reading and language arts so that teachers may work more effectively with P-12 students, other teachers, administrators, and community members. The program is consistently perceived by its various constituents as well-designed, rigorous, and responsive to the needs of its students.

Both programs are clearly focused on preparing candidates to support *all* students in developing proficiency as readers through systematic planning and organization of instructional activities based on comprehensive assessment strategies. Candidates become skillful in using intervention strategies that are effective with children within the context of a variety of subject-matter disciplines. In most cases, candidates are full-time teachers, and their courses include requirements to apply what they are learning in fieldwork assignments designed for students in their own classrooms and schools—an opportunity the candidates view as particularly gratifying. Coursework both in the certificate program and in the specialist program challenges candidates to become grounded in the theoretical frameworks in reading and to critically evaluate research based on these theories. Curriculum planning activities require candidates to build on sound theoretical models and to analyze and articulate the rationale behind their decisions through use of an ongoing process of assessment, evaluation, and instruction. Candidates are encouraged to accommodate the diverse interests, needs, and abilities of P-12 students and to utilize differentiated instructional methodologies to support the success of English language learners and students with special needs.

In the specialist program, candidates develop a strong sense of responsibility for providing leadership as reading professionals who are able to cite relevant research as a basis for their recommendations. In this regard, advanced clinical experiences develop candidates' ability to skillfully and sensitively assess the needs of struggling readers and to prescribe appropriate and effective interventions.

Based on a modified cohort structure, the graduate students enrolled in the certificate and specialist programs develop strong collegial relationships with the faculty and with one another that contribute to their ongoing professional development. The program coordinator and faculty encourage the candidates to become actively engaged in the reading field through conference

attendance, action research, presentations, and membership in professional organizations such as the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English.

Strengths:

Candidates were enthusiastic about all they were learning in the reading programs. They especially appreciated that the programs are theory-based and challenging. Many said they felt very well prepared for leadership roles in reading and that the programs at CSULB enjoy an excellent reputation among district administrators throughout the region.

Candidates repeatedly voiced their gratitude for the sense of camaraderie they were able to develop through collaboration in and outside of class. Typical comments from candidates were:

“I *love* this program.”

“I have grown tremendously in my knowledge . . .”

“The professors go out of their way to offer extra support, as needed.”

Concerns:

None noted.

Designated Subjects: Vocational Education Teaching Credential
Designated Subjects: Adult Education Teaching Credential

Findings on Standards:

After the review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, full and part time faculty, the credential analyst, employers and school administrators, university administrators, supervisors and advisory committee members, it is determined that all program standards are met for the Designated Subjects Vocational Education Teaching Credentials and the Designated Subjects Adult Education Teaching Credentials. The Designated Subjects programs demonstrated on-going program development, addressing and responding to the identified needs of students and the community comprised of their employers.

Strengths:

The Designated Subjects Credential Program and the Designated Subjects Adult Credential Program at California State University at Long Beach are excellent models offering comprehensive preparation for candidates to teach a wide variety of vocational and adult education programs. Because students usually are employed in their designated subject areas prior to entering the credential program, there is urgency on their part and on that of the employing schools to begin preparation in an expeditious time frame. The large majority of students in these programs are completing their Level I and II within the first three to four years of their program.

Graduates stated that this program was excellent in providing much needed assistance they previously assumed they did not need. The students commend the delivery of teaching strategies through cooperative learning methods and group instruction. All students interviewed were

extremely complimentary toward the coordinator, the faculty, the credential analyst and the clerical staff. They always feel welcome when entering the department, the classes and the offices. A major strength of these programs is that they have a credential analyst who is exclusively employed to serve them. The credential analyst attends all classes on the first meeting, registering the students, selling the texts and answering any questions and concerns. These staff members are also on campus in the evenings at the onset of classes to assist students. Any time a student cannot get to the campus earlier than six o'clock the analyst will arrange to be on hand to accommodate the student or students.

Upon examination of qualifications, it was ascertained that all faculty have appropriate backgrounds of advanced study and/or professional experience directly related to their assigned courses. In addition the students, through evaluations and follow-up materials, have bestowed many accolades on this superior faculty.

The Designated Subjects Advisory Committee has commendable active involvement in ongoing recommendations for revision of syllabi, materials, technology and offerings to insure quality for both the vocational teaching credential and adult teaching credential. The coordinator is commended for continuing to meet with and take action on the advisory committee's recommendations. This committee represents all of the CSULB service areas. A second advisory committee for distance learning programs is active and provides meaningful input for individual locations. The recommendations of this committee have been documented and there is evidence of positive modifications occurring.

New grants received annually by the department allow for a variety of opportunities for assistance to candidates. Programs have been implemented which allow for monetary assistance to students who might otherwise not be able to pursue and/or complete a credential and/or degree program or both.

The University support to this department and these credential programs is extremely strong in provision of the facilities for the programs and monetary support to add faculty, both full and part-time tenure track faculty. The two new full-time tenure track positions are scheduled to be filled by Fall 2007.

The constant follow-up system is a strength to be noted. There is evidence that the information garnered from this process is used to make changes and improvements in the programs. Only the best-qualified candidates are retained in the program. There is an ongoing advisement system, which assists in the retention of the qualified candidates and removal of the unqualified candidate. The faculty, coordinator and staff are providing candidates with constant and consistent support, encouragement and assistance throughout the experience.

In contrast to survey feedback in the self-study report, student and community diversity is reported by students and graduates to be a major strength of these programs. Students interviewed offered examples of assignments. This included culture, ethnic, gender, language and all special needs populations. The diversity issues in the classes were reported to be far beyond an awareness level. The graduates stated that they were well prepared to work in a diverse contemporary setting. The ethnicity of the faculty and the teacher candidates is

representative of the students they ultimately serve. Recruitment efforts are made and appear to be successful.

Concerns:

None noted.

Adapted Physical Education Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Adapted Physical Education (APE) Credential Program.

The Adapted Physical Education Credential program has an excellent process for preparing candidates for credentialing. Students are given immediate feedback on their progress and assistance in improving their pedagogical skills. All candidates meet with the APE Specialist Coordinator to understand the prerequisites and required documentation in preparation for their final student teaching. The Credential Candidacy Committee then takes that information into account prior to placing the candidate in the field to do student teaching. For candidates who are found to be lacking in readiness to move on to student teaching, there are procedures in place to help them qualify to proceed with their student teaching.

Candidates participate in field experience observing different sites and APE classes prior to being assigned to student teaching. After beginning student teaching, their progress is assessed every four weeks during their assignment. The final step in completing student teaching includes the presentation of a professional portfolio based on appropriate professional standards.

Strengths:

The attention given to the competency of credential candidates prior to being placed in schools for student teaching is a definite strength.

California State University Long Beach graduates and candidates in the Adapted Physical Education credential program, without exception, described their program as a highly positive experience and felt confident and well prepared to respond to their student teaching assignments.

Candidates, graduates, faculty and local school district personnel reflect enthusiasm and praise of the California State University Long Beach APE credential program.

Concerns:

None noted.

Education Specialist Credential
Mild/Moderate Level I and Level II with Internship
Moderate/Severe: Level I and Level II with Internship

Findings on Standards:

Based on the Institution's responses to the appropriate Program Standards, interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, supervising practitioners, University administrators, and employers, the team finds the following: All standards are fully met for both the Mild/Moderate and the Moderate/Severe Level I and Level II credential programs, as well as the Mild/Moderate and the Moderate/Severe Level I Internship Credential Programs. After reviewing documents and conducting numerous interviews, the team determined that this program is highly regarded by students, adjunct faculty, field supervisors, and employers. In fact, graduates expressed a highly personal level of gratitude to faculty and staff for their support and for the rigor of the program. Additionally, graduates consistently expressed confidence that they are well prepared for their teaching roles and responsibilities, and that sentiment was echoed in the interviews with field supervisors and employers.

The Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe education specialist curriculum is rigorous, with expectations for high academic performance clearly articulated. Early and ongoing fieldwork is integrated across the programs to ensure that teacher candidates have ample opportunity to apply theory to practice. Graduates and current students of the educational specialist credential programs state that the teacher preparation curriculum is meaningful, providing ample knowledge and skills to use in their classroom teaching.

Strengths:

The University is to be commended for offering both CSET and RICA preparation courses at no charge to candidates. The Education Specialist program is most effective in training candidates for teaching English Language Learners. Students are impressed that faculty members teach and conduct research in the public schools. Two assignments in the program were of special note: the functional behavioral analysis project and the systems change project. Students were most impressed that faculty members co-teach courses and that a parent of a person with a disability is hired as a co-teaching instructor. Students feel that they are well-trained in the area of advocacy for disabled persons. The pilot project in data collection involving IEP's is commendable. The Demonstration Network Teachers project is most creative.

Concerns:

None noted.

Clinical Rehabilitation Services Credential
Language Speech and Hearing

Findings on standards

Having reviewed the institutional report, supporting documents, and after having met with faculty, students, graduates, community members, supervising personnel from the collaborating school districts, and employers, the team found that all standards are met for the Clinical Rehabilitation Services credential.

Strengths***Candidate preparation***

The amount of supervised on-campus clinical practice students receive prior to off-campus practicum placements far exceeds the number of hours required to meet ASHA standards and is far greater than that required by other programs preparing SLP's in the region. Additionally, the link between course seminars and clinical experience is explicit since the same faculty teach the content seminars as supervise the clinics.

Students describe a faculty who are knowledgeable, approachable, responsive, understanding and flexible. They were especially enthusiastic about the experience with and preparation for working children and adults with diverse cultural and other language backgrounds. Members of the advisory committee indicated total satisfaction with the preparation of the SLP graduates.

Responsiveness to community needs

Undergraduate students majoring in Communication Disorders may opt to do 70 hours of supervised clinical experience in order to receive a School Language Pathology Aide credential. While this program certification is currently only authorized through Community college credential offices, offering this option at CSULB provides students employment opportunities related to their career interests while pursuing their graduate programs in Speech Language Pathology. The SLPA also meets a need for the local districts in providing cohorts of qualified personnel to work and under the direction of a fully credentialed CCC SLP.

Located in the greater LA basin, the department has embedded awareness of diversity and commitment to enhancing the candidate exposure to issues related to working with diverse cultures and linguistically different populations into all aspects of the program.

Program Improvement

As a result of student concerns, advisory committee requests, and responsiveness to the growing evidence in the literature of increased numbers of children identified with Autism, the program added both a seminar and an on campus clinical experience in Autism. Simultaneously, they combined seminars and clinics of the low incidence areas of voice and stuttering in order to maintain a reasonable unit load.

Concerns:

None noted.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Professional Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, program coordinator, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential programs.

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential can be earned with or without a Master of Arts in Education option. The Master of Arts option includes the completion of eight core courses which are closely aligned with the California Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credentials adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Education in January, 2004, and the completion of 9-12 additional units of advanced study with an emphasis on diversity, reform, and graduate level research into school based problems. Candidates can complete the preliminary administrative services program only or the combined program leading to the Master's degree. While the scope of this report deals with the credential part only, it should be noted that the research component is highly valued by the students and is considered to be quite strong.

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program is written, as noted above, to meet the new CCTC standards. The program document is clear and reflects all of the elements of the standards and the program itself offers ample evidence that those standards are being met. The Professional Administrative Services Credential program has also been written to meet, and has been approved as meeting, the new standards. It, too, is clear and addresses all of the elements of the standards. There is evidence that the standards are being met as it is currently being implemented. This review, conducted from April 29-May2, encompasses the implementation of earlier standards (pre-2004), with an emphasis on the new standards. The new program shows a clear strengthening of course offerings with a focus on the College of Education's conceptual framework and the program's mission statement.

The dominant themes of both the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential Programs are a commitment to urban education and social justice. These themes are evident in the course syllabi and are responsive to the major demographic areas served by California State University at Long Beach. Both programs reflect a strong balance of theory and practice. Employers note that graduates of the programs have a good blend of content knowledge and practical experience. The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program has requirements that include field work assignments embedded in each core credential course and related to a content domain plus a fifteen day administrative field placement in a school other than the candidate's home school. That requirement must be completed during a summer session or during an intersession. Courses in the Professional Administrative Services Credential Program emphasize reflection on current practice and applying theory and research to on-the-job problem solving needs.

Both programs are responsive to aggregated student and employer feedback and the new program documents reflect a revision of courses and sequence of offerings responsive to the

feedback. Students did note, for example, that a previous combination of human resources and school finance content into one course did not meet their needs and there are now two distinct courses in the program to meet this concern. The new curriculum and supervision courses also respond to current school needs in instructional leadership.

Both programs have high retention and completion rates which the students attribute to a faculty monitored admissions process. The programs are offered as cohorts, both at the University and in collaboration with the Long Beach Unified School District.

Strengths:

The programs have sound content in all courses, but the connection to the practical setting is especially strong. The field work requirements, especially the 15 day requirement for candidates to work in an administrative setting other than their school or district office site, is particularly noteworthy and has been cited by candidates and employers as being a unique feature of the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program. It is exemplary and could serve as a model for other programs.

The faculty provides vision and leadership that serves the program in an exemplary manner. Faculty set the standard for meeting student needs and guiding and advising them throughout the program. The other faculty members teaching in the program are solid in their content domains.

Concerns:

None noted.

**Pupil Personnel Services Credential
School Counseling**

Findings on Standards

Upon a review of the institutional report, program document, supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, advisory board members, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the School Counseling program.

Faculty and staff in the School of Education encourage all candidates to adhere to high standards of professional conduct through course syllabi, classroom activities, professional modeling and personal mentoring. Reflective and experiential instructional strategies, along with solid theoretical grounding, provide students with opportunities to assess personal strengths, areas for remediation and targets to attain in their professional growth. A cohort structure gives students an opportunity to get to know others and build lifelong relationships. A focus on leadership, advocacy, assessment and accountability is imbedded in many of the courses.

The School Counseling program has achieved a high degree of credibility and visibility within the University's service region. School counseling candidates are sought by administrators from local schools and school districts, often voicing unsolicited praise to program faculty and the Counseling Department for providing highly qualified and competent candidates to their schools.

All counseling faculty demonstrate an understanding of the professional role of the school counselor and the scope of professional practice.

As part of fieldwork supervision and monitoring, candidates meet every other week with their supervisor for one hour to debrief and discuss issues, concerns, and progress. Every other week candidates meet in small groups of 5-6 with their university supervisor to discuss how they are doing, receive feedback and support one another.

Strengths

There are numerous strengths in the school counseling program at California State University, Long Beach.

- A major strength is the collaboration that takes place with the public schools where candidates are placed.
- Candidates and faculty collaborate in diverse communities.
- The application, interview and selection process for acceptance into the program is rigorous and thorough, thus establishing high standards. The quality of the candidates in the program is exceptional.
- A supporting environment for candidates is quite evident. Candidates learn a lot about themselves as they progress through the program.
- School counseling graduates entering the work force are highly knowledgeable and well prepared.

Concerns:

None noted.

School Psychology Credential School Psychology Internship

Findings on Standards:

The institutional report, with supporting documentation, was carefully and thoroughly reviewed. Candidates, graduates, employers, practicum and internship supervisors, advisory board members, and department and program faculty were interviewed. Based upon written documentation and interviews, it was determined that all program standards for the School Psychology Program, including internship, are met. There is evidence that the program provides candidates with a strong foundation in the knowledge base for the discipline of psychology, as well as the knowledge base specific to the professional specialty of school psychology. There is evidence that candidates are well versed in a variety of assessment methods, including formal and informal test administration, behavioral assessment, interview techniques, ecological or environmental assessment, as well as assessment methodologies. There is also evidence that candidates provide culturally appropriate services to California's diverse population. Faculty has established long-term relationships with practitioner-supervisors in the field who provide candidates with appropriate field experiences. Several of these practitioner-supervisors also serve as adjunct faculty in the program, thus enhancing the students' relevant experiences in the program. These practicing adjunct faculty members also provide an important source of information about candidate performance and overall program effectiveness in the field.

Candidate competence is determined through multiple measures and at multiple points, including course assignments and examinations, supervisor and faculty ratings, and either a master's thesis or the passing of a comprehensive examination. The program has enjoyed an excellent employment history of its graduates, and many become supervisors for practicum students.

Strengths:

The program has recently received approval from the National Association of School Psychologists, effective until December 31, 2007.

A strong and consistent partnership between Long Beach Unified School District and the College of Education has provided many opportunities for collaboration between program faculty and the schools. Candidates, graduates, employers, and department faculty consistently voiced support for the partnership. There is evidence of strong unit support for the school psychology program.

Concerns:

None noted.

**School Social Work Credential
Child Welfare and Attendance**

Findings on Standards:

After careful review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews with program faculty, institutional administrators, candidates, graduates, employers, supervising field instructors, advisors, school administrators, and advisory committee members, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Service Credential: School Social Work and the Authorization in Child Welfare and Attendance.

Evidence for the Department of Social Work's commitment to school social work and child welfare and attendance is seen in the allocation of 4.40 full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) positions. The numbers of students who are preparing for the MSW and the two PPSC authorizations comprise 12.74 percent of the Departments' Master level social work students.

Strengths:

Candidates, graduates, supervising field instructors, campus faculty, employers, and the PPSC Advisory Committee members, without exception, praise the well organized PPSC program, and the strong and open communication linkages with the Social Work Department.

Faculty, supervising practitioners in the schools and employers deem graduates of the program to be well prepared and highly competent. They particularly praise graduates' abilities to: conduct multi-system assessments and interventions, broker positive home-school partnerships, and provide culturally competent services.

Candidates and graduates praise the high level of teaching in the department and the excellent mentoring provided in field supervision. Candidates and graduates felt prepared, confident and competent to begin employment and see themselves as life-long learners.

- 1.The Stevenson/YMCA Community School (LBUSD) was conceptualized in 1997 through a \$50,000 planning grant that was written by the Department of Social Work. Today, it has a variety of long-term funding sources (\$1,242,800). This is an outstanding example of collaboration and partnership among CSU Long Beach, children, families, Long Beach Unified School District and the YMCA. In 2003 Stevenson/YMCA Community School was identified as a California Distinguished School. In 2006 it was also awarded the National Award of Excellence by the National Coalition for Community Schools.
- 2.Since AY 2000 the Department of Social Work has generated over \$16 million for school-aged children, families and K-12 school intervention programs. The Department of Social Work accounts for almost 2/3 of all new awards to the College of Human Services and ¼ of all new awards to CSU Long Beach.

Health Services (School Nurse) Credential

Findings on Standards:

The findings and recommendations are based on data gathered from the program document report, review of supporting documentation and interviews with School Nurse Credential Program and Graduate Coordinator, faculty, clinical faculty, candidates, graduates, preceptors in the field, Department of Nursing Chair and the Associate Dean of Health and Human Services. It is the finding of the team that all program standards for the Health Services Credential are met.

The Department of Nursing undergraduate, graduate and certificate programs are regularly evaluated by external accrediting bodies as well as internal reviews. The California Board of Registered Nursing (2004-2012) and the American Association of Colleges of Nursing Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (2001–2011) reviews resulted in full accreditation without areas of deficiencies. Within the graduate program, the pediatric nursing practitioner option provides the core curriculum for the School Nurse Services Credential Program.

Strengths:

The faculty believes the goal of the program evaluation process is to develop the most effective instructional program for preparing undergraduate, graduate and school nurse services credential students to meet the complex demands, changes, and challenges of delivering health care to society. Candidates, graduates, faculty and site preceptors unanimously recognize the high level of preparation of the candidates. The program design, rationale, and coordination meet the standard. Candidate advisement and support were reported as excellent. Opportunity for evaluation and feedback was on-going.

Concerns:

The Department is in desperate need of classroom, laboratory and office space. The Department is in a capital fund drive. The drive is expected to reach the goal within the next few years. None other noted.

Library Media Credential

Findings on Standards:

The findings are based on data gathered from the program report, review of supporting documentation, and interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, employers, advisors, and advisory committee members. Candidates receive the skills and knowledge base to be well-trained library media teachers who can serve California's diverse student population and adapt to the ever changing needs of the school communities they serve. All standards for Library Media Teacher Services Credential and Master's Degree Program are fully met. The reviewed print and electronic documents and numerous interviews, demonstrate that this program is highly regarded by students, graduates, adjunct faculty, field supervisors, advisory committee members, and employers.

The Library Media Teachers Services Credential curriculum is rigorous, with expectations for high academic performance, yet assignments are practical and immediately applicable, ensuring that LMT candidates have ample opportunity to apply theory to practice. Graduates and current students of the LMT credential program state that the curriculum is immediately meaningful, providing ample knowledge and skills to use in their libraries.

Strengths:

The Library Media Teacher Credential Program provides visionary and dynamic leadership for the program. The program design, coordination, and quality control is exemplary. The curriculum is up-to-date and effective and is ever ready to adapt to changing needs as determined through on-going research and data gathering. The program provides leadership not only on campus but throughout the country and internationally.

Resources, including the use of technology to deliver instruction to students is commendable and much appreciated by the students who have access to instruction "face to face," online, or as hybrid", meaning a combination of both. Students have access to a variety of "electronic tools:" including listservs, email access to faculty, web sites (which contain the course outlines, office hours, assignments, and text of reading materials), computer labs, and other electronic information. In addition there is an outstanding and lively collection of children's and young adult literature in the university library. The university library also maintains many electronic databases and thousands of journals online.

The mix of full-time and adjunct faculty as well as collaborating faculty from other departments in the university, adds to the strength of the program. Graduates expressed their continuing appreciation for the leadership, faculty and the adjunct faculty for their high level of mentoring and support both during the program and after completing it. They also said that they valued and continue to draw on the rich contacts they made with faculty and fellow students.

Students and graduates, many of whom were already working provisionally as library media teachers (LMTs), consistently said that they felt well prepared for their library media teaching roles and responsibilities due to the practical applications of their assignments.

Concerns:

None noted.

Professional Comments

Multiple Subject

Candidates interviewed frequently expressed the desire for more formal preparation with regard to classroom management techniques, especially with discipline. In the MSC program, candidates said they only received this when they take an elective course. More exposure to affirmative and positive discipline techniques might be worth increased emphasis.

Single Subject

A more effective system of archiving program documents and student portfolios should be pursued to help guide the collection of aggregate data and foster program improvement. CSULB should use its ties and outstanding levels of collaboration to help LEAs establish Future Teachers of America high school programs to recruit potential college teaching candidates. The team also recognizes the use of a variety of instructional strategies as a positive program element for working with diverse groups of learners.

Education Specialist

It is suggested that additional funds be allocated for assessment instruments. Concerns were noted from employers and students about the scheduling of field experience observations. It is suggested that a data base of model sites be established and that a student guide for appropriate procedures for contacting schools be written. Students expressed a desire for a dual single subject/Education Specialist credential. Concerns were also expressed for more training on specific disabilities, such as emotional disturbance. Students expressed a desire to continue their education in the advanced level programs at CSU–Long Beach and were concerned about possible enrollment limitations.

Designated Subjects

The follow-up instrument might be revised to include detailed directions to assure accurate feedback. It is suggested that there be a line asking the respondent to identify their current position. Include crisis intervention and planning instruction in the teacher credential programs to meet the current trends towards school campus violence. Some individuals indicated a need for a process for supervised field experience for those candidates who do not already have teaching positions. It is suggested that the programs consider including crisis intervention and planning instruction in the teacher credential programs to meet the current trends towards school campus violence.

Reading Certificate and Specialist

Some candidates suggested that it would be valuable for the graduate reading courses to include additional content about effective strategies and interventions relevant to middle school and high school teachers as well as a focus on specific reading disabilities such as dyslexia so they are better prepared to assist adolescent students who are experiencing reading difficulties. It was recommended that University resources be directed at recruiting underrepresented candidates into the M.A. Ed. reading program since in the region and state there are high numbers of K-12 male students of color being identified as needing reading programs and services.

Administrative Services

Program faculty might wish to consider strengthening the technology component of the program, either in existing courses or in a separate new course.

Some candidates have suggested that more emphasis be given to provide specific preparation within existing courses for the position of vice-principal as opposed to principal since it is the entry level position most will seek. There are no program concerns; however, it is important that the open full-time, tenure track program faculty position be filled expeditiously to assist the program coordinator since she currently is responsible for the duties of two people.

School Social Work

It was observed that the PPSC Seminars augment the concurrent Master of Social Work/PPSC program. In the post-MSW/PPSC program the PPSC Seminar content is held in school district placement sites. The Social Work faculty may want to take steps to ensure that the on campus PPSC Seminar and placement-site content are comparable and in alignment as to knowledge, skills and dispositions.

Clinical Rehabilitative Services

Program should develop a systematic system to assess candidate performance. Entry-level data is available but limited exit data is available. One can assume that all graduates take and pass the Praxis for SLP, based on the information that 100% of graduates are employed and that employment requires a degree, credential/license and the CCC or be completing the CFY. However, it is suggested that the program consider requiring that the exam be taken prior to graduation as part of the culminating experience. This would effectively demonstrate evidence of candidate performance.

School Nurse

Several Candidates expressed concern for the adoption of the Special Teaching Authorization in Health Program Standards, Standards 30- 32 in the new Program. Reflecting the visionary leadership of faculty, a new program, School Nurse Services Credential Program, Post-Baccalaureate Option may be offered for Fall 2007. The faculty and leadership are to be commended for responding to the needs of the local school districts for the option.